DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 027 274 SP 002 309

By-Hemsing, Esther D., Comp.

A Decade of Thought on Teacher Education: The Charles W. Hunt Lectures.

American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education, Washington, D.C.

Pub Date 69

Note-272p.

Available from-The American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education, 1201 16th Street, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20036 ($5.00).

EDRS Price MF-$1.25 HC Not Available from EDRS.

Descriptors-College School Cooperation, *Educational Needs, Educational Sociology, Individualized Curriculum, Instructional Technology, Interdisciplinary Approach, Leadership Qualities, Professional Education, *Speeches, Staff Utilization, Teacher Certification, *Teacher Education, Teacher Qualifications

Identifiers-Africa, National Council for Accreditation of Te, NCATE

This collection of 10 speeches, each of which was presented at one of the annual meetings of The American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education from 1960-69, has as its major theme the needs of teacher education. The speeches range in breadth from a specific proposal for restricted state-approved teacher certification to a general description of educational dilemmas and their remedies in differentiated staffing, charismatic teachers, and social relevance of both teacher education and noncollege curriculums. The speeches range in approach from enumerating the essentials of teaching to awakening the audience to the high priority of education in Africa. Topics which recur through the speeches also include: cooperation between public schools and colleges and among departments within a college, individualized education (for students, teacher trainees, and inservice teachers), definitions and roles of scholarship and leadership, teacher sensitivity, educational technology, professional training, and the role of research. Biographical data for each speaker is included. (LP)

ED0 27274

960-1969

PROCESS WITH MICROFICHE AND
PUBLISHER'S PRICES. MICRO-
FICHE REPRODUCTION ONLY.

A DECADE OF THOUGHT ON TEACHER EDUCATION: THE CHARLES W. HUNT LECTURES

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

SP002309

THE AMERICAN ASSOCIATION OF COLLEGES FOR TEACHER EDUCATION

Permission to reproduce this copyrighted work has been granted to the Educational Resources Information Center (ERIC) and to the organization operating under contract with the Office to Education to reproduce documents included in the ERIC system by means of microfiche only, but this right is not conferred to any users of the microfiche received from the ERIC Document Reproduction Service. Further reproduction of any part requires permission of the copyright owner.

Copyright © 1969 by
The American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education
1201 Sixteenth Street, N.W., Washington, D. C. 20036
Standard Book Number: 910052-34-4
Library of Congress Catalog Card Number: 74-79560

Compiled by Esther D. Hemsing

CONTENTS

Introduction 4
EDWARD C. POMEROY

The Lecture Series 7

A Life Devoted to Education 8

1960 The Dimensions of Professional Leadership 11
LAURENCE DEFEE HASKEW

1961 Revolution—in Instruction 29
LINDLEY P. STILES

1962 Imperatives for Excellence in Teacher Education 55
J. W. MAUCKER

1963 Africa, Teacher Education, and the United States 81
KARL W. BIGELOW

1964 Teacher Certification: The Restricted State-Approved Program Approach 105
JAMES B. CONANT

1965 Perspective on Action in Teacher Education 143
FLORENCE B. STRATEMEYER

1966 Leadership for Intellectual Freedom in Higher Education........ 183
WILLARD B. SPALDING

1967 Tradition and Innovation in Teacher Education 205
REV. CHARLES F. DONOVAN, S.J.

1968 Teachers: The Need and the Task.... 231
FELIX C. ROBB

1969 A Consumer's Hopes and Dreams for Teacher Education 267
ELIZABETH D. KOONTZ

INTRODUCTION

A true pioneer in the development of education in America, Charles W. Hunt early recognized the importance to our nation's schools of properly prepared teachers. He was thus a forerunner of today's widespread appreciation of the critical role of teacher preparation in meeting the needs of citizen and society.

Charles W. Hunt had the vision to see that a voluntary association of colleges could harness the resources of the college community to improve the quality of teacher education. Starting in the 1920's as one of a relatively small band of dedicated teacher educators, Dr. Hunt saw voluntary cooperation as the key to progress in education in a democracy.

For twenty-five years as secretary-treasurer of the AATC and AACTE, and subsequently as an active consultant to the AACTE, Dr. Hunt encouraged the broad participation of all who were dedicated to improve teacher education, whatever their divergent points of view. From the beginning he worked to build bridges of understanding between the educators of teachers in the public and private sectors. He made welcome the viewpoints of practicing teachers in the education of future members of their profession. These efforts strengthened higher education's commitment to teacher education and widened the base for improvements in the quality of teacher education.

The ideal of a well-educated and qualified teacher for every child has been the guiding principle of Dr. Hunt's professional career. In this he was joined by such contemporaries as Walter Morgan, Edward S. Evenden, Paul Sangren, Wendell W. Wright, and Walter Anderson, in addition to hundreds of other educational leaders. This group working together through the years laid the groundwork for the creation of AACTE.

In 1959 AACTE instituted the Charles W. Hunt Lecture Series as a tribute to this educator's contribution to teaching, to society, and to the organization itself. Each year an outstanding educator has been selected to address himself to a major problem in teacher education. After a decade of these annual contributions to the continuing dialogue on teacher education, it is appropriate to review the lectures, reassess their scope, and contemplate the changes that have come about since that day of February 10, 1960 when the first Charles W. Hunt lecture was presented.

The lectures constitute a singularly pertinent catalog of the issues teacher education faced during the past decade—leadership, technology and its influence on education, the greater priority needed for excellence in education, the shift in focus to international education, institutional organization, certification and accreditation, the calamitous need for better teaching in our cities.

A realistic appraisal of teacher education today reveals that none of these issues has been resolved. This fact ought not to discourage but rather challenge all who share in the responsibility of teacher preparation. In changing times there can be no final answer as to how a teacher is to be prepared.

These lectures are published by the AACTE in order to share with all concerned the insights into the problems of teacher education won over the past decade by ten nationally recognized educational leaders. These findings speak also to the even greater challenges of today and illuminate the nature of the task to which educational statesmen such as Charles W. Hunt have devoted so much of their lives.

—Edward C. Pomeroy
Executive Secretary

February 1969

THE LECTURE SERIES

The Charles W. Hunt Lectures, given over a period of ten years at the Annual Meeting of the American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education commencing in 1960, were established by action of the Executive Committee of the Association. The Lecture Series was conceived as a professional tribute to the long years of leadership and service which Dr. Charles W. Hunt has given to teacher education as a teacher, a university dean, a college president, secretary-treasurer of the American Association of Teachers Colleges, secretary-treasurer of the American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education, and, most recently, as a consultant to the Executive Committee of the AACTE.

Charles W. Hunt has combined vision with practicality in encouraging voluntary cooperation among higher education institutions for the improvement of teacher education. The AACTE is proud to acknowledge its great respect and appreciation for Dr. Hunt's educational statesmanship, his devotion to teacher education, his insights into human behavior, and his personal friendship.

Charles W. Hunt

A LIFE DEVOTED TO EDUCATION

"To meet him once, to feel his firm handshake, to look into his face with that squinty smile, is to experience the morning light of the spring sunshine. To be in his presence, to enter into discussion with him, to challenge him in argument, to see him guide tough-minded men with different points of view into consensus about significant problems, is to know the light of the midday sun. To have him as a friend to whom you go when you are weary, spent, and cannot see ahead and to have him, through his gentle guidance, give to you a transfusion of courage and purpose, is to feel the glow of the evening sunset that promises a new tomorrow. Such a man is Charles W. Hunt, whom so many of us have had the privilege of knowing."

—Wendell W. Wright
Spoken at the Twelfth Annual Meeting of the AACTE, in Chicago, February 19, 1960.

Charles Wesley Hunt, born in Charlestown, New Hampshire, October 20, 1880, educated at Brown University (A.B. 1904), Columbia University (A.M. 1910, Ph.D. 1922); teacher of English, Vermont Academy, Saxtons River, 1904-06; Moses Brown School, Providence, Rhode Island, 1906-08; teacher, Horace Mann School, Teachers College, Columbia University, 1908-09; supervising principal, Union School, Briar Cliff Manor, New York, 1910-13; supervisor, Children's Aid Society Schools, New York City, 1913-14; assistant secretary, Teachers College, Columbia University, 1914-16; vice-principal, Horace Mann School, New York City, 1918-21; director of extramural instruction, University of Pittsburgh, 1921-24; acting dean, School of Education, University of Pittsburgh, 1923-24; dean, Cleveland School of Education, 1924-28; professor of education and dean, School of Education, Western Reserve University, 1928-33; principal, New York State Normal School, Oneonta, New York, 1933-42; president, New York State Teachers College, Oneonta, New York, 1942-51; secretary-treasurer, American Association of Teachers Colleges, 1928-48; secretary-treasurer, the American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education, 1948-53; consultant to AACTE Executive Committee since 1953.

THE DIMENSIONS OF PROFESSIONAL LEADERSHIP

L. D. Haskew

❦

The First Charles W. Hunt Lecture

Presented at the Twelfth Annual Meeting of
the American Association of Colleges
for Teacher Education
Chicago, Illinois
February 10, 1960

10/11

Laurence DeFee Haskew was born in Alabama on October 4, 1907 and began his professional career as a high school principal in Georgia. He was school superintendent at Monroe, Georgia, for ten years. For one year of that period he also served as superintendent of Walton County schools. He was director of teacher education at Emory University and Agnes Scott College, 1941-1947. He has taught also at the University of Georgia, Georgia Teachers College, Columbia University Teachers College, New York University, and Stanford University.

Through his activities to improve school and college programs in Texas and the nation as a whole, Dr. Haskew has become a widely recognized figure in education circles. His leadership and advice are sought by state and regional groups throughout the United States, and he has held office in major educational organizations of national scope.

Dr. Haskew was president of the American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education during 1954-1955 and has been a member of the Educational Policies Commission of the United States. As executive secretary of the American Council on Education's Committee on Teacher Education, 1945-1946, he visited colleges in forty states. In 1946, he also served as technical consultant for the President's Commission on Higher Education. He was dean of the College of Education of the University of Texas at Austin from 1947 through 1962. He also was vice-chancellor of the University of Texas System from 1954 through 1967. Since then he has been professor of educational administration at the University of Texas. In August 1968 he was appointed by President Lyndon B. Johnson as the first chairman of the National Advisory Council on Education Professions Development.

THE DIMENSIONS OF PROFESSIONAL LEADERSHIP

BY L. D. HASKEW

THE FIRST CHARLES W. HUNT LECTURE

The story of your speaker's life is one of being called upon repeatedly to assume responsibilities far beyond his talents and abilities. The responsibility of inaugurating the Charles W. Hunt Lectures for the American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education climaxes that story.

Choice of a subject for this lecture was left to me, but was almost dictated by the tradition within which these lectures had origin. The curious and baffling alchemy of leadership has spread its intriguing and sometimes intoxicating perfume wherever teacher educators have gathered with Charles W. Hunt in their midst. The formula for the advancement of teacher education in this country, as is true of the formula for advancing any other important concern of professionals, always contains a personal equation. That personal equation defines professional leadership; this, in the long run, is what gives not only dynamics to combined action by professionals but also that flavor which is known as character, in the finest moral sense of that term. I have chosen to speak about that equation.

14/15

First, the setting. The American society of 1960 is dependent to a degree seldom realized upon the actions, interactions, and counteractions of organized professionals. To the professions, important trusteeships have been assigned; much of the effectiveness with which individual members of the profession discharge that trusteeship is dependent upon the actions of the professional organization to which they belong. Organized professionals conceive what would be best for them. In many cases, they control the supply of professionals, define the circumstances under which the people can get the professional services the people want. Inevitably, organized professionals compete with other organized professionals and with the general welfare; their success in competition determines the destiny and well-being of countless other people. Many times, the societal value of a fundamental social institution such as religion or education is dependent not upon its net worth or its potential for service, but upon the success of organized professionals in the perpetual games of power politics and compelling propaganda. In brief, all of us have a tremendous stake in what organized professionals leave undone, what they decide to try to do, and how well they do what they have decided upon.

The American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education is one organization of professionals. Its members hold trusteeship for a tremendously important phase of America's social endeavor—the education of teachers for its school enterprise. Banded together, these members have created machinery for seeking to relate themselves constructively to the demands of their parent society, for influencing the decisions of that society, for competing for the welfare of what they consider to be an important concern. They have also created machinery for reaching internal decisions on what purposes to serve, what procedures to use, what services to render, how to balance the common good against their own particular benefit, what influences to have upon the standards and methods of performance by each other. This is an organization with great resources and potentially strong influence now, a creature with the power of self-direction. It is not, however, a governing body; it holds no proprietorship of teacher education nor any pledge of allegiance from its member institutions. That it will advance, or even protect, the cause of teacher education is not assured, and that it will promote the best interests of American society is far from certain. Achievement of these objects is facilitated by organization, made more likely by professionalism, but finally determined by the quality and character of the leadership which is followed. This is the setting for a discussion of dimensions of professional leadership.

Leadership is a social phenomenon in which a group, or aggregation of individuals, accepts and acts upon the ideas of one person. Schematically, leadership may be represented as three-dimensional. One of the dimensions is ideational—the content and value of the proposed actions. Thus we can have good leadership and bad leadership, measured on a scale which represents absolute values as they are held to be by those who apply the scale. Those who apply a scale first are the members of the group or aggregation involved, and they may be influenced by an immediate pragmatism. Eventually, however, a larger history applies a scale whose points of reference have something approaching an eternal orientation, but this occurs after the fact of leadership. So far as leadership is concerned, it is the immediate response which determines the value of the ideational content.

The second dimension of leadership is social. In a very real sense the total social setting, as it dwells within the members of a group, influences not only the ideas which are produced, but also those to which they will attend and, finally, adhere. Further, the idea-adherence or person-adherence which defines leadership is a group phenomenon. Ideas may be proffered, but leadership never comes into existence until they are accepted and acted upon by a group or aggregation. The quality of group idea-choosing, therefore, has vast effects upon the quality of the ideational dimension of leadership. Successful demagoguery is much more a commentary upon those who support it than upon those who practice it. The members of professional organizations "call the shots" on what kind of leadership they will have by what they will buy.

Sometimes they get unexpected bargains. They buy a "personality guy" and he turns out to have brains. Or, they buy a piece of high-flown, meaningless prose in the form of a resolution and deliver it to an executive secretary who turns out to be a shrewd operator in using resolutions to endorse the actions he was going to take anyhow. Such bargains are all too rare, however. The quality of the leadership phenomenon in a profession seldom rises above the quality of the consumer demand for ideas in that profession. "Fuddy-duddies" usually produce "fuddy-duddy" leadership, mundane realists usually have mundane leaders; and forward-looking, vigorous professionals can be counted upon to generate, at least occasionally, leadership that is truly inspired.

The social dimension of leadership is more than a variation upon the theme of consumption, however. The theme of production is equally important. For one thing, a profession develops its own leaders by the processes and caliber of personal interchanges it affords within its group. It can have a rigid, smothering process of acculturation operated by an impregnable and heedless hierarchy and thus throw on the scrapheap the talents and potentialities of young individualists. Or, it can have a viable and freewheeling style of operation which almost forces cream to rise to the top.

For another thing, the very ideas which form the essence of leadership are in large measure, although not completely, the products of interactions within the group itself. Let us be perfectly clear here. A profession can have leadership if only one man in the whole organization ever has an idea; all that is necessary is that enough others be willing to go along with him. Even further, the notion that all good ideas are *ipso facto* group-produced is a major fallacy, in this speaker's opinion. Yet the fact remains that the sheer meritoriousness of leadership ideas has a high positive correlation with the volume, thoughtfulness, and creativity of the ideas produced in group interchanges. Show me a profession whose chief means of communication is the exchange of traditional *clichés* and I will show you one whose leaders are throwing custard pies in an age of nuclear missiles. We professionals, banded together in organizations, get not only the leadership we are willing to buy but also the leadership we—and the pronoun is significant—produce.

The third dimension of professional leadership is personal. No sociological explanation of the leadership phenomenon can dispense with the fact that leadership does reside with persons. For two decades or more we have been preoccupied with what are called "group processes" and "group dynamics" in an effort to produce a science of leadership. Some fairly careful inquiries have tended to demonstrate that no single characteristic or trait makes a person a leader independent of the social situation in which the leadership relation develops. We have interpreted these findings to mean that the origin of leadership is to be found within group interactions rather than within individuals. The net result has been, all too often I fear, an abdication from responsibility for leadership by too many people with the capacity to be leaders. Reliance upon the group can mean, and has meant, a dangerous loss in self-reliance and self-responsibility in creating the phenomenon of professional leadership.

What all the researchers have not been able to wipe out is the plain fact that there are leaders—persons who time after time emerge as the ones whose ideas are followed, who secure the mandate of spokesmanship, who blaze trails that the group accepts as upward roads. Without such a person, or persons, an organization is poverty stricken in leadership phenomena, and the cause which it represents is almost certain to languish in desuetude. As strongly as I know how, I want to champion the position that professional leadership is an extension of a person—a positive, forceful, person who thinks he or she has something to offer and who offers it unashamedly and vigorously as his bounden duty.

Let us admit at once that the personal dimension of leadership is, in and of itself, strictly amoral. A dedicated and persuasive champion may be just as wrong as he can be, or "just as right as rain." The leader can destroy his followers or he can ennoble them; can win allegiance by sacrificing principle as readily as by upholding it. The personal dimension of leadership derives its merit only from the ideational and social dimensions which complete it and, at the same time, govern it. Within this context, I repeat, a person is an essential ingredient of leadership for a profession.

In 1960, teacher education—and hence all of America—needs to produce the phenomenon of leadership. Perhaps that need is greater than it has ever been before. At least, such was the conviction held by this speaker, almost forcing him to choose the subject he did choose. *For leadership, there must be leaders.* Some finger of conscience, of duty, of obligation because of benefits received, of just plain ambition to get a great job done, is pointing at individuals in the profession of teacher education—asking them to try to be leaders.

Using Charles W. Hunt as a case study in the personal dimension of professional leadership, some of us here assembled may be able to derive personal lessons—and personal challenges—on some of the qualities which enter into the making of a professional leader. I have chosen six to name.

Meekness is the first. Time after time we find that the leader is a person who has been captured and tamed by a cause. This, I am told, is one of the original meanings of the Greek root from which we derive our word "meek," and it certainly sheds light upon the prediction that "the meek shall inherit the earth." The leader who has meekness is literally possessed by some goals much bigger than he is, much more important to him than his own aggrandizement and often his own physical and economic well-being. He lives and breathes his cause, perceives most of his environment in relation to that cause, invests his fundamental life-energy to further that cause. And, most important of all, his meekness affects in fundamental fashion the ideas he can espouse and the actions he can recommend.

If there has ever been another time when the leaders of teacher education have been so seductively tempted to forget meekness, I have not known it. The air crackles with abuse from which they can at least partially escape by denying that they ever knew the man. They find themselves in hallowed company when they join in efforts to equate teacher education with any good variety of college education. They are strongly tempted to frame requests for grants of funds for special institutes or experimental programs in terms of what they suspect the granting agencies would approve rather than in terms of what would be good for teacher education. They find it easy to busy themselves with all sorts of peripheral activities which are sure to put them on one or another of the currently popular bandwagons. In the midst of all these Sybaritic calls, teacher education stands in sore need of some leaders with meekness.

A second thing which enters into the making of some professional leaders is sheer knowledge—knowledge of practice in the profession. Ideas proffered from ignorance can be nearly as effective in winning allegiance as are ideas proffered with the strength of knowledge back of them, given equal amounts of persuasiveness by the potential leader. Amusement parks are not the only places where attractive "barkers" get people to ride on merry-go-rounds. In the long pull, however—and the advancement of a professional concern is always a long pull—the value of ideas based on knowledge demonstrates itself. The profession, if it is wise, learns to attend to those who have been willing to pay the price of knowing what they are talking about. These persons tend to emerge, almost but not quite automatically, as leaders. They become the stabilizing, dependable guides and counselors who help erect foundations of true progress by laying one brick on top of another.

What would happen in teacher education if twenty people in this audience really paid the price of knowing the past and present practice in the profession is anybody's guess. Mine is that we would have ideas with a new degree of excellence to follow. We would have more humility and less hypnotism, more pioneering and less repetition, more guided evolution and less wild revolution of spinning wheels. I think we would have more, and more meaningful, experimentation and perhaps less clinging to old myths. I know we would have some leaders we could follow with confidence.

The third characteristic of some leaders is that of being servitors. We do not like that word. In fact, many of us would choose it as the perfect opposite of leader. Yet, when we study the careers of men who have been over and over again leaders in and for their professional organizations, we find this word "servitor" jumping out at us. A servitor is one who performs servile tasks, and that is just what these men have done. They ran the mimeograph machine after the evening session adjourned at midnight. They spent their holidays making sense out of the report of a committee session. They got five people to serve on a panel and wrote their speeches for them. They served as executive secretaries, the twentieth century synonym for galley slaves, and transformed the glittering generalities of "big-shot" directors into concrete accomplishments.

I single out this characteristic because I think it comes about as near as any in distinguishing the men from the boys among leaders. The man who can push buttons and delegate responsibilities does frequently emerge as a leader. The trouble is that pushing buttons is a double first cousin to passing the buck, and delegation is closely akin to satisfaction with the mediocre. The leader who finds his dignity in the job to be done, who is willing to say, "well, somebody has to do it," who is less concerned with his liking for a task than with the value of the outcome—this leader seems to be the man who carries on when the boys drop by the wayside. I do not need to add that our profession should be searching for men, men who have learned from the discipline of servitude the lessons of accomplishment.

Any leader is always "up to his eyebrows" in people. A fourth thing that is strikingly true of some of the greatest leaders I have known is that they have faith in people. This seems to be the gyroscope which brings them back to true course when the buffetings of outrageous fortune cause lesser captains to lose their bearings.

The advancement of professional ends and the discharge of professional trusteeship are human enterprises, carried on by some frail human beings operating in the midst of other frail human beings. Time after time in the past thirty years we have witnessed almost certain catastrophe for and within teacher education. There was a time when the petty politics of state officials seemed almost devilishly bent upon sacrificing quality in teacher education to the demand for spoils. Then, there was a time when it seemed inevitable that ambitious men would splinter teacher education into several impotent fragments. Most of those here recall the grave misgivings caused by what we interpreted as obstinate opposition of the National Commission on Accrediting.

In these and many other crises there were those of us who counseled punitive and aggressive action. We thought we had weight and we wanted to throw it around. Those "dumb bunnies" never would learn; they had to be shown. There were others who felt that the only thing to do was to surrender to human obtuseness; with mournful self-pity we would just pick up our unappreciated marbles and go home. Fortunately, however, we had leaders who had faith in people. Somewhat reluctantly and with considerable trepidation, we followed them. If my memory serves me correctly, not once have we found that faith misplaced or unwise. To that faith, we owe much of the painful progress made in the preceding generation.

Teacher education still needs leaders with faith in people. Direct, decisive action appeals to all of us, but in a human enterprise we have only one source for great strength; and that source lies in large numbers of people who have convinced themselves that the intelligent course is the really correct course. Believing implicitly that the members of a profession as well as the people outside a profession can come to recognize the intelligent solution and then embrace it, leaders for teacher education can put us in touch with true and enduring strength.

The fifth characteristic I shall name is the most debatable of the lot. Many would contend that it will prevent a man from becoming a leader of a professional group, rather than make him one. That characteristic is greater loyalty to the common good than to the profession's program.

Allen Drury's *Advise and Consent* has confronted us anew with the complex dilemma of where a man shall place his ultimate loyalties, with the ever-present tension between right and *right.*[1] "The man who would rise above party will never rise in the party," the cynic tells us.

Yet, it does appear that we have had some great leaders of professional groups who have been able to see, and to get others to see, that the profession is a means to an end. Granting that the emergence of such individuals is rare subtracts nothing from the value of the phenomenon when it occurs.

In teacher education, this characteristic for leaders has particular virtue. We can never let a dichotomy develop between what is good for teacher education and what is good for the American society. In fact, the special genius we need in our leaders is the ability to discover and proclaim what is good for all the children of all the people, and then to translate to us professionals what we can do to hasten that good. Teacher education has no crying need for leaders to protect it, no imperative demand for leaders to improve its status in academic circles. Its great imperative is for leaders who can project it into the center of American efforts to use education for high and noble ends. We should welcome the appearance in our midst of men and women whose first loyalty is to this common good.

---

[1] Drury, Allen. *Advise and Consent.* New York: Doubleday, Doubleday & Co., 1959.

Finally, leaders are prophets. They are painfully aware of the shortcomings of the past, the mistakes and ineptitudes of the present. Knowledge has not made them complacent; experience has not made them either cynical or inoffensively patient. They are willing to give time to recording the minutes of the last meeting, but their real life bets are placed upon concocting dreams for the next one.

Essentially, prophets are men of vision. They see what can be, not in the best of all possible worlds, but in this world. And seeing, they proclaim; they exhort; they persuade. They do not call a group meeting and sit all silent and "democratic" while the group decides whether they want to decide anything at this meeting. They do not keep mum in order to avoid stifling initiative. Instead, as vigorously and as effectively as they know how, they share their visions.

In haste I point out that there is a world of difference between a vision and a pipedream. Prophets have paid the price; they have accumulated knowledge. They have pondered long and faithfully, sought insight and revelation. They have seen not only a destination but a way to start from right here and reach that destination. Not all leaders are prophets; not all prophets are leaders. But, teacher education will be much blessed if we can have more and more prophets doing their dead-level best to become leaders.

The dimensions of professional leadership are three: ideational, social, personal. I have tried to make a compelling argument that the existence of the leadership phenomenon is important for all professional endeavors, and particularly for teacher education. The character of the phenomenon is more important than its existence, however. Inspired by the career of Charles W. Hunt, I have tried to say that what we need is not more social analysis but more leaders, and say it in such fashion that every person here is looking forward to having a lecture series named after him also.

❧

REVOLUTION—IN INSTRUCTION

LINDLEY J. STILES

❦

THE SECOND CHARLES W. HUNT LECTURE

Presented at the Thirteenth Annual Meeting of
the American Association of Colleges
for Teacher Eucation
Chicago, Illinois
February 22, 1961

Lindley Joseph Stiles is a native of New Mexico, born July 1, 1913. He attained his A.B., M.A., and Doctor of Education degrees at the University of Colorado and began his teaching career in the public schools of Boulder, Colorado. There he served for seven years as principal of a junior high school and of a senior high school, and as director of instruction for the public schools. He has taught at the College of William and Mary, the University of Illinois, the Ohio State University, and has served as dean of the School of Education and director of summer sessions at the University of Virginia and dean of the School of Education, University of Wisconsin. His present post as professor of education for interdisciplinary studies, sociology, and political science at Northwestern University, in 1966 was the first of its kind. A special assignment as consultant to the Carnegie Foundation-supported Tutorial-Clinical Teacher Education Project at Northwestern furthered his goal of interdisciplinary cooperation between academic scholars and professors of education with practicing members of the teaching profession.

Dr. Stiles holds membership in a number of professional associations and honorary societies. He is also a past president of the National Society of College Teachers of Education and has been active in parent-teachers and state educational associations. His travels have taken him to parts of the world as disparate as Nigeria, Costa Rica, the UAR, Thailand, Germany, and India, where he made studies of teacher education and education programs.

Dr. Stiles has directed his professional efforts toward improving standards in teacher education and extending research services of the schools of education to teachers and school systems. He has worked to recruit greater numbers of able young people into the teaching profession and to attain prestige, better working conditions, and higher salaries for those who teach. Dr. Stiles has published extensively in the professional field.

REVOLUTION –IN INSTRUCTION

BY LINDLEY J. STILES

THE SECOND CHARLES W. HUNT LECTURE

The schools of the United States are currently undergoing what may realistically be called a revolution in instruction. This address honors a man, Charles W. Hunt, who has demonstrated remarkable capacity to lead as well as to live with revolutionary times in education. It purports to identify and to analyze the factors and developments that make up the instructional revolution now under way. Its purpose is to increase insight and perspective, to broaden understanding, to identify forces and directions, rather than to enlist recruits or to champion a cause, either old or new.

Like all revolutions, the one now in progress in the field of instruction is a product of the times. It seeks to correct deficiencies of the past and present with visions and promises of better ways. It appeals to and catches the hopes and imaginations of people. Yet at the same time, it stirs unrest and uneasiness for fear that established values and proven procedures will be sacrificed on the altar of change as untested theories win advocates and new practices are tried out. Revolutions, like politics, create strange bedfellows and raise up new aspirants for leadership. Also, they may provoke sharp schisms between equally sincere and devoted citizens and professionals. The revolution in instruction is no exception to these characteristics.

SIGNS AND SEEDS OF REVOLUTION

The instructional revolt has earmarks that are typical of all revolutionary enterprises. It is, first of all, a protest against the status quo. It strikes against inefficient instructional processes that have persisted in elementary, secondary, and collegiate schools. It promises improvements in procedures, materials, and equipment as well as in the total organization for instruction. As is typical of revolutionary tactics, condemnation of existing leadership is a primary means of rallying support to new proposals. Competition for control of revolutionary movements is keen as various dissident groups appeal for public attention and endorsement. Some enjoy considerable financial support as well as access to vital channels of public information, including the daily press, books, radio, and television. Characteristic of revolutionary times, irresponsible opportunists and publicity seekers confuse a restless and uncertain public with sensational and intemperate attacks while more responsible professionals grope for ways to introduce the new in an orderly fashion without throwing the nation's schools into chaos.

Seeds of the current instructional revolution were planted more than a half century ago when courageous educational leaders dared to dream that higher quality in instruction for elementary and secondary schools could be achieved. Those seeds were sprouted and cultivated during the 1930's in the theories and research of professional educators who sought to make teaching more creative and learning more self-directive as well as insightful. The attention given during those years to discovering how to cultivate in students the all-important capacity for reflective thinking is related directly to the current interest in producing better creative scientists as well as intellectual leaders in all fields. The adaptation of audiovisual devices as aids to instruction that was initiated during that period laid the foundation for later interest in educational television. Likewise, prior to World War II, experimentation concerned with developing creativity, teaching mathematics as a science of proof, preparation for college, and various instructional procedures, i.e., laboratory techniques, teacher-student planning, and independent study, sowed seeds of discontent with the status quo of schools that two decades later were to grow into revolutionary movements.

World War II interrupted what astute observers recognized as a budding instructional revolution in schools and colleges. The emergency conditions the war created curtailed research on instruction in schools. At the same time, interestingly enough, the various branches of the armed forces fostered greatly expanded experimentation in this field. Faced with the task of teaching maximum skills and highly scientific knowledge to masses of men in a minimum of time, military agencies were forced to discover new techniques for instruction. The effect was to produce a generation of young citizens who had experienced more efficient instruction in the armed forces than schools had offered. The conclusion of the war was soon to bring a state of anxiety that produced a variety of challenges to schools and colleges from a public which believed that instruction in schools must and could be greatly improved. The criticisms came so fast and with such vigor, in most instances meshed with intemperate, irresponsible attacks on teachers, school administrators, and teacher educators, that those in charge of schools and teacher education—the original instigators of the revolution—were thrown on the defensive. Those who sought to renew their own challenges to the status quo often found themselves aligned with the new revolutionists; consequently, they were often ostracized by their professional colleagues. As a result, many chose to join forces together against all efforts to challenge school practices and to leave the revolution to outsiders.

While skirmishes were being fought between various revolutionary groups (many of which were led by amateurs more interested in notoriety than the improvement of instruction) and those responsible for school programs, a renaissance in educational experimentation was rapidly taking place. This movement has had the support of such important philanthropic organizations as the Ford Foundation, the Kellogg Foundation, and the Carnegie Corporation of New York, as well as others that operate on state, regional, or national levels. The American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education, allied with the Associated Organizations for Teacher Education (AOTE), has assumed a key role in guiding efforts toward research on instruction and teacher education. Leading institutions for teacher education have initiated programs on a broad scale to improve schools and teacher education. The United States Office of Education has established a cooperative program of research and has given direction to the implementation of the National Defense Education

Act which has in itself revolutionary implications for phases of instruction. All these efforts have enjoyed the leadership of responsible professional educators.

Because the leadership for instructional change is now in the hands of educators whose personal motives are reputable, whose scholarship is sound, whose commitments are to schools in the United States, and who are accountable for their leadership to the public, to their positions, and to their profession, the revolution may be expected to proceed in a more orderly, democratic fashion—without bloodshed or character assassination—and in accordance with proven facts as well as with support from a majority of the people. As it advances, the promising new procedures may be expected to be assimilated with the proven old ones to add strength to instruction, while warring factions may well join forces to give bipartisan educational leadership to the vital educational venture.

Causes of the Revolution

The causes of the revolution are known to all. The mushrooming enrollments, during a period when there are not enough adults to provide sufficient personnel for all fields that require highly developed professional competence, forecast a shortage of outstanding teachers for at least another twenty years. The need to use teaching talent in ways to gain maximum benefits is an urgent necessity. Greatly increased demands for highly educated intelligence place a premium on instructional skill, in all fields and at every level of the school system. The rapid expansion of knowledge in the social studies and the humanities, and particularly in the sciences, has produced the inescapable requirement that we must teach more of the proper content in less time with greater permanence and must make skills and knowledges function more effectively.

In the face of persistent demands for higher quality, for more efficiency in instruction, and for teaching greater numbers of students, technological discoveries that have proven beneficial in other fields are being adapted for use in teaching. As "necessity is the mother of invention," the critical instructional problems are stimulating the creative use of electronic machines to relieve teachers of some time-consuming, routine chores and to improve the general quality of instructional services.

Although the causes of the instructional revolution are known, not all schools and colleges accept them as irrevocable. Many still continue with instructional programs and procedures that were out of date a generation ago. They seem to be indulging in a type of "whistling in the dark" that suggests that they are attempting to ride out the revolution by ignoring it.

Characteristics of the Revolution

Some characteristics of the revolution in instruction are becoming clear. They include: insistent demands for excellence in teaching, new designs for the utilization of the talents of teachers, adaptations of electronic devices to extend the contributions of good teachers to more students, development of machines to facilitate greater self-direction of learning, and the updating and reorganizing of content for courses. Throughout, research is seen as the instrument by which improvement is achieved.

Demand for Excellence in Teaching

Teaching, unlike other professional fields, has been slow to demand, recognize, and reward excellence. While other fields have rigorously recruited young people of high intellectual ability and offered career patterns that reward quality contributions, the teaching profession has limped along, content to admit almost anyone, including rejects from other professional fields. It has offered practically no inducements for able, ambitious individuals who are not content to be submerged into uniform teaching assignments and lockstep salary policies and has not provided full opportunities for personal professional development and advancement.

The instructional revolution moves forward under the flag of excellence in teaching. It boldly invites into the teaching profession young men and women with quality minds, broad liberal preparation, penetrating scholarship in subject fields, and highly refined ethical values as well as superb personal and human traits. It recognizes that, given these qualities, pedagogical skill and knowledge can be developed with proper instruction and supervision. The revolution is endeavoring to design programs of preparation that are intellectually stimulating and challenging to the gifted, many of whom heretofore have been repelled from teaching by the mediocrity of the requirements for the profession. It searches for ways to identify and to reward superior teaching in order that excellence in teaching will forever be encouraged.

New Designs for Instruction

During the past thirty years, instructional procedures in elementary and secondary schools have been under constant attack. As universality increased, demands for adaptations to individual differences became more insistent. When larger classes reduced student participation, the long-established recitation came under fire. The developing scientific method was the source of a theory of teaching that focused attention on the student's reenactment of the process of discovery and interpretation, rather than on the teacher's presentation of the "packaged" results of scholarship. At the same time, mass education was producing, particularly at the upper levels, mass teaching.

Patterns for organizing instruction were also undergoing change. Consolidations of one-room schools into larger units, with more pupils per grade or course, permitted instructors to concentrate on teaching particular grade levels or subjects with commensurate specialization in their preparation. Emphasis on departmentalization, in both secondary and elementary schools, fluctuated from degrees of specialization to arrangements that required teachers to teach all subjects in a grade or several fields at the high school level. Each plan for the organization of instruction achieved popularity for a time, largely because of the advocacy of leading educators rather than as a result of proven evidence of superiority. In recent years, the pendulum has swung toward the arrangement of one teacher to an elementary grade group or a high school subject field.

The key to the success of the one teacher to a grade or course plan of organizing instruction rests with the competence of the individual teacher. It should be said that many well prepared and experienced teachers have demonstrated unusual ability to carry all the multiple responsibilities of the self-contained classroom, or composite course, with amazing success. The number of such versatile teachers is small, however, compared to the demand. For this reason, and in anticipation of even greater shortages of outstanding teachers, certain questions are now being raised about whether the one-teacher plan is the best type of organization for instruction in a given school or for particular groups of learners.

1. Is the assumption valid that the varied interests, scholarship attainments, and range of professional competencies required for one teacher to carry the full burden of instruction are common to all teachers?

2. Is the preparation of the beginning teacher sufficiently intensive, and is interest in all areas of the school program or subject adequate, to guarantee effective instruction in all the skills and content for all pupils? The crucial aspects of this question can be illustrated by examining the demands upon elementary teachers who work at the upper grade level. Here the curriculum includes an emphasis upon as many as eight or nine different broad fields of knowledge, each of which may include from three to six different subject areas from which the content for the elementary school is drawn. In addition, the teachers must be prepared in the various areas of professional education which usually include a minimum of three foundation fields, methods of teaching for various aspects of the elementary school program, and practice teaching. Equating the preparation for

elementary teaching in terms of credits earned in college study, perhaps the beginning teachers need at least 180-200 semester hours of college work, if minimum preparation for the responsibilities of the self-contained classroom teacher are to be met.

3. Can the teacher, even when well prepared initially, keep abreast of the rapid advances in knowledge that are now taking place? The practice has been, for example, for high school teachers of science to be trained to teach all the sciences offered in the secondary school, including mathematics. Some educators now suggest that this objective is impossible to attain, even for the experienced, well prepared teacher, because the content is so broad and is changing so rapidly.

4. Can gifted children be given maximum help without being in touch with competent specialists in skill and subject fields? Do they not need to work with teachers who are highly specialized as well as capable of motivating and guiding the learning of the academically talented?

5. Is it possible for the teacher in the self-contained or individual-teacher classroom—because of the diversity and burdensomeness of his assignments—to achieve or maintain a satisfying level of creative endeavor or scholarship in any one field of specialization?

6. Are the teacher's personality and professional skill so equally appealing to all members of the group of students as to justify the exclusive instructional relationship that the individual-teacher arrangements require?

7. Is it not desirable to develop differentiations of professional skills and competence that permit teachers to be promoted from one level of salary

and responsibility to another within the ranks of teaching itself?

8. In the face of the shortage of teachers, does an obligation not exist to extend the benefits of outstanding teachers to as many children as possible?

The instructional team[1] is a term used to designate an organization of teaching resources that matches for instructional and learning purposes a school-staff team with a relatively large group of students. Its major purpose is to improve the quality of instruction. It seeks to achieve this goal by making teachers, at peaks of their professional performance, available to students who are most able and ready to benefit from quality teaching.

One of the oldest instructional-team demonstration projects has been carried on since 1956 in the schools of Lexington, Massachusetts, in cooperation with the Harvard Graduate School of Education.[2] It has been described as having the following characteristics:

1. *Teachers are redeployed.* This means that instead of a teacher's being limited to one group of from 25 to 30 students, she may, from time to time, work with as few as one student and with as many as 100 or more. This is done in order to take advantage of her strengths and to de-emphasize any weaknesses she may have.

2. *Children are regrouped.* This means that

---

[1] Note the use of the word "instructional" rather than "teaching," inasmuch as it designates, in addition to professional teachers, personnel who are not certified to teach and who do not actually engage in teaching.

[2] Smith, John Blackhall. *Team Teaching: An Approach to Elementary Instruction.* Greenwich, Connecticut. January 1960. (Mimeographed)

children are no longer established in a group of 25 to 30 at the beginning of the school year and maintained in that group. Depending on the subject taught, the technique used, the facilities employed, and the learning ability of the student, children are grouped from time to time in sections as small as one and as large as 100 or more.

3. *Flexibility is essential.* The school program no longer operates on a regimented basis. Scheduling and programming are fitted to the instructional pattern rather than suited to teaching on a timed schedule. In size and form the physical facilities are arranged for the benefit of instruction.

Experimentation with instructional teams is now going forward in key and representative school systems across the nation under leadership from numerous institutions of higher learning. These efforts to improve instruction have been stimulated by grants from the Ford Foundation, but both the school systems and the universities involved have made substantial investments in these projects.

Electronic Aids to Teaching

New electronic aids to teaching loom as a threat to many teachers, particularly to those who have taken their mission casually and who are still employing nineteenth century instructional procedures. Elementary, high school, or college teachers, for example, who rely exclusively upon the teacher-centered lecture, demonstration, or explaining technique, without help from the wide variety of audiovisual resources available to vitalize and enrich their procedures, now find themselves virtually expendable with the advent of television teaching. In fact, the wide dependence upon the lecture method in colleges and universities endorses strongly the value of television to extend the impact of the talented teacher to more students, in the interest of universality, as a step toward excellence, and at a saving in cost.

In recent years, of course, thousands of high school and college teachers have improved their presentations by the use of audiovisual aids. Yet, in the typical lecture section, the professor still stands before fifty to five hundred students, often using a public address system, presenting without interruption his views, explanations, or interpretations, in a predetermined order and at a set pace. Interaction between teacher and individual student is negligible. Questions and discussion are reserved for quiz sessions or omitted entirely. The lecturer may not engage in a personal conversation with students and would not recognize many of them were he to meet them on the campus. In elementary and high schools, far too many teachers rely almost totally upon traditional teaching procedures, ignoring the variety of films, slides, recordings, charts, maps, and other resources that might enliven and strengthen their pedagogy.

To substitute live television or teletape presentations for the lecture or any class in which the pattern of instruction does not allow for laboratory work, student questions, and the exchange of ideas between student and teacher, or in which the rich audiovisual and library resources now available are ignored, could vastly improve the quality of instruction in the United States. The use of the expert teacher made possible by the vehicle of television will not, many point out, detract from the importance of the role of the teacher in the classroom. Rather, it becomes an added resource to assist teachers to improve the quality of the learning experiences provided to students.

Anyone who has viewed the instructional presentations on "Continental Classroom," a project originally sponsored by the American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education with financial support from the Ford Foundation and several leading industrial corporations, must agree that the availability of such excellent television teaching makes a class period spent with an immature, unskilled, and uninspiring teacher an inexcusable educational practice; it is a waste of time and money both for the student and the institution. Educational television places teaching everywhere on trial to prove that classroom teaching has contributions to make that cannot be made better, to more students, and at less expense via television.

Self-Direction in Learning

The formalization of learning in schools with the focus on the teacher's control and regulation of study, recitation, and examinations tended to reduce the emphasis placed upon self-direction in learning. As class size increased, the resulting lockstep procedures tended to bore the bright and to discourage the slow.

Aspects of the instructional revolution aim at encouraging anew student initiative in learning. They range from teacher-student planning, independent study, and honors-type, creative intellectual activities to the use of learning machines that enable students to master programmed material as rapidly as individual abilities permit. Adaptation of tape-recording devices have made possible various types of learning laboratories—in foreign languages, shorthand, speech, arithmetic, history, geography, science, English—that permit members of large class groups to respond to various rates and types of electronically reproduced drill and thought exercises. Such arrangements free teachers to provide individual assistance to pupils in time formerly required for directing class work.

Combination television-correspondence courses have been found to be valuable aids to self-education. In Wisconsin, Professor Wittich and associates proved that students in small high schools which did not have teachers of physics could learn as much physics from a combination of the "White" physics film with correspondence lessons as did their counterparts in large schools who had the benefit of regular group instruction in physics.[8]

Honors programs are another means of permitting and encouraging bright students to educate themselves by pressing beyond the rate and level of their classmates. Such programs help students to learn more in less time without constituting a heavy drain on instructional resources.

A necessary adjunct to all self-directed instructional programs is the recognition and measurement of achievement in qualitative rather than quantitative terms. The half-century old system of evaluating school progress largely on the basis of time-spent-in-class, valuable as it has been in many ways, is inadequate as a means of gauging the achievement of bright students who are directing many aspects of their own learning.

---

[8] Wittich, Walter A. *The Wisconsin Physics Film Evaluation Project.* Minneapolis: School of Education, University of Wisconsin. April 1959.

Reorganization of Content

Quality in instruction depends, first of all, on the selection of skills and content to be taught and on the teacher's proficiency in the field. The current growing rebellion against content that is out of date, superficial, redundant, peripheral, or irrelevant is very much a part of the instructional revolution. Every field—mathematics, the sciences, history, economics, geography, literature, languages, as well as the arts and vocational subjects—must continually be kept abreast of both rapidly expanding knowledge and the coming times for which education must prepare.

To keep content up to date teachers must be well grounded initially in their fields of specialization and must continue their scholarship while teaching. No longer can one high school teacher be expected to teach three or four different subjects. Specialization in one comprehensive field, such as English or the social studies, or two closely related subjects, such as mathematics and physics, or mathematics and chemistry, is demanded if teachers are to keep content abreast of new knowledge.

The need for specialization reaches into the upper grades of the elementary school as well as into the high school and college. Here the conflict sharpens between those who hold with the practice of the last twenty-five years that conceived of the elementary teacher as a master of all skills and subjects in a "self-contained classroom" and leaders of the revolutionary proposition that elementary as well as high school teachers should be permitted to specialize.

Research: the Instrument of Improvement

The most significant characteristic of the instructional revolution is the emphasis being placed upon educational research, both basic and applied. For the past thirty years educational programs have had to be improved largely through trial and error and the exchange of successful experiences among school people. Unlike medicine, business, or agriculture which could call upon vast research resources to discover and refine knowledge as the basis for new developments, education has not had the benefit of established facts to undergird improvements. In those few instances where educational research has been supported over a long period of time, the results have amply justified the investment; but support for educational research, both financially and in terms of commitment, has been too meager and too spasmodic.

The instructional revolution is showing signs of being research-oriented. To the extent that it is, it offers hope of establishing foundations of educational practice in which confidence may be placed. As yet, many of the newer developments in the field of instruction have not been tested sufficiently to demonstrate their superiority over the procedures they seek to replace. Only the rigors of objective research can tell us whether the old or the new is worthy of endorsement.

IMPLICATIONS FOR TEACHER EDUCATION

The revolution in instruction affects teacher education directly. Changes in the organization and use of instructional resources, teaching procedures, and content of courses require parallel adjustments in the manner in which teachers are prepared. Major impact so far points to the following goals for teacher education:[4]

1. *The achievement of institution-wide control and responsibility for teacher education.* This aim rests on two premises: (a) The total institutional resources should be drawn upon to help strengthen schools. (b) All who help to prepare teachers should share democratically in the formulation of policies, planning of programs, and appraisal of results. When this aim is realized, the half-century-long conflict between professors of education and of liberal arts will be ended. Stronger programs of teacher education and leadership for education will result.

2. *Higher standards for the selection of prospective teachers with emphasis on recruiting the "best" for teaching.* The teaching profession is challenged to reject the age-old assumption that "anyone can teach." Rather, it might well stand boldly on the conviction expressed in the following lines:

> The best should teach,
> The next may preach,
> Though some must heal the sick;
> If I could say
> To each his way,
> This order I would pick.
> All else is naught
> Unless it's taught
> With wisdom, skill, and power;
> The world awaits
> The opening gates,
> By teachers of the hour.

---

[4] Stiles, Lindley J.; Barr, A. S.; Douglass, Harl R., and Mills, H. H. *Teacher Education in the United States.* New York: The Ronald Press, 1960. 497 pp.

3. *Design of honors-type programs of teacher education that challenge gifted students who are preparing to teach.* Such an objective will require flexibility in programs of both preparation and certification to permit adaptations to variations in knowledge and ability with particular reference to: (a) time of decision to prepare for teaching, (b) background of previous education and experience, (c) intellectual ability and skill in working with people, and (d) student preferences for particular patterns of preparation.

4. *Strengthening of liberal education as well as scholarship in the teaching fields of prospective teachers, at both preservice and in-service stages.* Experiments in this direction, such as those sponsored by the National Science Foundation, have revealed the need to redesign many college courses in academic fields, particularly at the graduate level, to provide maximum service to teachers in elementary and secondary schools.

5. *Relating the pedagogical aspects of preservice teacher education more closely to supervised laboratory work in schools and with students, with special attention being given to the fifth-year internship.* Ample evidence indicates that learning to teach is an exciting challenge to highly able young people when methods and foundational knowledge are integrated with firsthand experience. The object, as AACTE's President Henry H. Hill explained so succinctly in the May 1960 issue of *Atlantic Monthly,* is always to produce professional teachers, in as efficient a manner as possible.

6. *Preparing prospective teachers for new patterns of organization,* i.e., instructional teams,

and for maximum use of electronic aids, learning laboratories, television and automatized instruction, as well as other teaching resources.

7. *Research to validate the value of programs of teacher education.* The goal must be to submit all theories endorsed and all procedures advocated—old as well as new—to the rigorous test of objective proof.

Through Revolution to Strength

When democratically conducted, revolutions have the potential of producing increased strength. Instruction in schools will gain from the current challenges, provided the concern is with ideas, facts, procedures, and results, rather than with the worship of dogma or cultism of any type, the glorification of leaders, or efforts to gain or retain control of schools or teacher education by any particular group. Each individual member of the profession will assume attitudes and relationships to the changes in progress in accordance with personal commitments to the status quo, awareness of the irrevocable forces that feed revolutionary developments, perceptions of the values and objectives that are being sought, and individual inclination to adventure.

For those who are inclined to stand with the past or to defend theory and practice of instruction developed during the first half of this century, the assignment is to prove that the established is superior to the proposed. For others who choose the role of the revolutionist, the challenge is to demonstrate objectively that new ideas, new organizations of instruction, new procedures, and new aids to teaching can contribute significantly to both enduring and new objectives. Because enthusiasm for the novel and dramatic often runs ahead of proven procedures, the latter individuals may well heed the experience of Dr. Charles W. Hunt, who tells of his boyhood practice of pushing a canoe out through the ocean breakers following a storm to ride the crest of a wave back to shore. The trick, as Dr. Hunt well knew, was to keep the direction right and the balance steady. The alternatives were to go "on" or "under" fast. Those who accept the challenge of the instructional revolution ride the crest of new ideas and change. This is an exhilarating experience. Direction and balance must be maintained, however, if progress is to be continuous.

Revolutionary developments in any realm generate intense feelings and loyalties among vigorous, dedicated, and equally sincere people. In the field of education, however, they need not produce damaging conflicts between proponents of different points of view. Changes in educational practice can be accomplished through proven democratic processes. Furthermore and fortunately, all sincere citizens as well as educators can ultimately be united under the single flag of truth. Until the facts are established identifying which instructional organizations and procedures produce superior results, it is well for all to remember that where progress is desired revolution is always in process, and the future should be embraced with vigor and harmony by all who anticipate it.

❦

IMPERATIVES FOR EXCELLENCE IN TEACHER EDUCATION

J. W. Maucker

The Third Charles W. Hunt Lecture

Presented at the Fourteenth Annual Meeting of
the American Association of Colleges
for Teacher Education
Chicago, Illinois
February 14, 1962

54/55

James William Maucker was born on September 16, 1912 and received his A.B. degree from Augusta College, his M.A. and Ph.D. degrees from State University of Iowa. His professional career in education started with his appointment as a public school teacher in Omaha, Nebraska. Since that beginning, Dr. Maucker has had varied educational assignments. He was a graduate assistant at the State University of Iowa while carrying out his advanced study, then moved to the position of research assistant in the office of the superintendent of schools in St. Louis in 1940-41. He served as an assistant professor of education at the University of Missouri and as a senior specialist in extended school services with the U.S. Office of Education. From early 1943 until a call later that year to active duty as a lieutenant (USNR) in World War II, he served as assistant superintendent of schools in Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania.

Dr. Maucker returned in 1946 to an active role in teacher education as dean of the School of Education, Montana State University. In 1950, he was appointed to the presidency of the University of Northern Iowa, a position he continues to fill with distinction.

Dr. Maucker has served, among other important state and national professional offices, on the Board of Directors of the Problems and Policies Committee of the American Council on Education, as a member and chairman of the National Commission on Teacher Education and Professional Standards, as president of the American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education, and as a member and chairman of the National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education.

He is a member of the National Education Association, the National Society for the Study of Education, the American Association of School Administrators, American Educational Research Association, and Phi Delta Kappa. He was given the Alexander Meiklejohn Award by the AAUP in 1968.

IMPERATIVES FOR EXCELLENCE IN TEACHER EDUCATION

BY J. W. MAUCKER

THE THIRD CHARLES W. HUNT LECTURE

This evening we honor a man who for forty years in these ranks has radiated unshakable faith in the value of cooperative endeavor to improve the education of teachers. Singularly unconcerned about protecting vested interests, Charles W. Hunt has constantly advocated the long, calm, forward look and the enlargement of the circle of "workers in the vineyard."

Since Dr. Hunt was for so many years the president of an institution with normal-school roots, I could see some logic in President Rackley's choice of a president from similar surroundings to follow the honorable deans from Texas and Wisconsin in this lecture series; but I must confess that preparation of a formal lecture has proved to be a sobering experience. I find it easy, as do most presidents, to speak, but extremely difficult to say anything. The difference between an administrator and a scholar drives itself home with a vengeance. After a few hours in the library, after the reading of several whole books, and after an extended session of "creativity" at the typewriter, to retreat to the office was actually a pleasure.

I quickly decided there would be no point in haranguing this audience on the importance of

58/59

teacher education and the need for more able personnel—of these matters you are fully aware. I would remind you parenthetically, however, that recruitment of more able personnel some years ago might have changed considerably the makeup of our gathering tonight. We tend to think of the personnel problem as one of bringing in more able novices—our "help" isn't good enough. But what education and teacher education need most desperately is more able leadership: more capable and courageous presidents, deans, professors, superintendents, principals, and supervisors. *We* are the bottlenecks; and it is to some of our shortcomings I wish to call your attention this evening.

THE SETTING: CHALLENGE AND RESPONSE

We are surrounded by increasing complexities: the population explosion, the revolution of rising expectations, the space race, automation, communication failure among intellectuals, urban growth problems, the vulgarization of culture —to name a few. Each of you could extend the list. Practically all of these far-flung developments stem from man's relentless pursuit and dissemination of knowledge, particularly in those branches of learning known as science. Adam really started something when he ate of the fruit of the tree of knowledge! And the only feasible remedy appears to be more knowledge, more education, and more research.

Two major results of the march of science confront us: (a) Decision-making becomes fantastically complicated as action A has consequences B, C, D . . . N in remote places and in unexpected aspects of life, putting an almost impossible burden on a democracy where the general citizenry plays a major role in the making of vital decisions. (b) The high standard of living resulting from the applications of science threatens us with complacency, the development of a "cult of ease" (slobbism, if you please), which saps our will to develop the insights and discipline required to cope with complexity. If we are not to become victims of our own achievements, we will have to counter with education of an extremely high order.

Such is the outlook in the long run. And in addition, we face a more immediate challenge from the Sino-Soviet axis: a power struggle for world leadership, if not for survival itself. Here again at bedrock the contest is essentially one of knowledge and discipline, a race in the discovery of new knowledge and the effective use of human talent.

But even if these pressures were not present, the authentic American dream calls for an educational system which provides every individual in the society with the opportunity to achieve his maximum potentialities. So we cannot rest.

CHALLENGES

What is required of us to meet these challenges? We must provide both *quantity* and *quality* in our educational services; we have hammered out agreement on that score since *Sputnik*. But what do we mean by *quality*? Does the concept of "excellence," the theme of this annual meeting, throw any light on the matter?

In his highly perceptive manner, Louis Benezet recently expressed skepticism regarding the interpretation of excellence in many quarters, observing wryly that "everybody talking about excellence isn't going there."[7] Nevertheless, I believe that the emphasis on excellence is important for us in education. As Lawrence Cremin has so carefully documented in *The Transformation of the School:* During the first half of this century, as part of the general humanitarian movement of the times and in reaction against formalism in the schools, educators increasingly stressed growth and socialization of each student.[8] This emphasis resulted in gains crucial in an earlier era (social harmony, Americanization, adaptation to industrialization, the welding of a young society), but it resulted also in a decline of emphasis on standards of achievement and in an unfortunate blurring of priorities in educational aims. Need I remind you that the Seven Cardinal Principles of 1918[9] listed "worthy use of leisure" on equal footing with "command of fundamental processes" and "ethical character"; and the report of the Educational Policies Commission in 1938 enumerated 43 objectives without any clear-cut indication of priorities among them. The "excellence" emphasis now represents a counter-reaction, stressing the need for higher standards of accomplishment, greater attention to intellectual achievement, and recognition of the central importance of the basic academic disciplines.

---

[7] Benezet, Louis T. "The Trouble with Excellence." *Saturday Review,* October 21, 1961. p. 44.

[8] Cremin, Lawrence A. *The Transformation of the School.* New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1961.

[9] Department of the Interior, Bureau of Education. *Cardinal Principles of Secondary Education.* Bulletin, 1918, No. 35. Washington, D. C.: Government Printing Office, 1918.

Lest the pendulum swing too far once again, so that schools begin to shrug their shoulders regarding their less capable pupils, we may well endorse the mandate of John Gardner, President of the Carnegie Foundation, who says, "*We must seek excellence in a context of concern for all.*"[8] To anyone puzzled as to how we can reconcile the drive for excellence with the facts of life concerning human limitations and individual differences, Mr. Gardner's response is that our conception of excellence must embrace many kinds of achievement at many levels. He is much concerned with this point:

> A conception which embraces many kinds of excellence at many levels is the only one which fully accords with the richly varied potentialities of mankind; it is the only one which will permit high morale throughout the society . . . The idea of individual fulfillment within a framework of moral purpose must become our deepest concern, our national preoccupation, our passion, our obsession . . . I am not saying that we can expect every man to be excellent . . . But many more can achieve it (excellence) than now do. *And the society is bettered not only by those who achieve it but by those who are trying.*[9]

In short, then, our educational system must aim at both *growth and excellence*, seeking to stimulate and assist each student to fulfill his highest potentialities, which will mean reaching high levels of excellence in many cases. And, as the Educational Policies Commission said only last year, the type of growth to be recognized as most uniquely and centrally the responsibility of the schools is *intellectual* growth.[6]

---

[8] Gardner, John W. *Excellence.* New York: Harper & Brothers, 1961, p. 77.

[9] *Ibid.*, pp. 131, 133, 161.

All this places a terrifying responsibility on teacher educators. We also must meet demands for both quantity and quality. We are challenged to provide an increasing number of teachers with sufficient competence and dedication to guide the growth of all and and stimulate excellence to the fullest, teachers who will inspire a lifelong drive for insights and moral outlook that will enable the American people at least to cope with the times and at most to build a great civilization. This will take some doing; it will require a radical leap to a new level of effectiveness in our schools and our teacher education programs. This in turn calls for a marked increase in the quality of leadership we provide.

Response

Fortunately, a good deal has been stirring in teacher education since the close of World War II. Men such as Bell, Bestor, Smith, Lynd, and Rickover have called attention dramatically to the scuttling of the scholarly disciplines. The academic community has rediscovered the schools. Teacher educators have organized more vigorously and more inclusively: the National Commission on Teacher Education and Professional Standards in 1946, the American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education in 1948, the Associated Organizations for Teacher Education in 1960, all collaborating increasingly with the learned societies. Most states have raised their formal requirements for certification of teachers, making the baccalaureate degree the minimum level for entrance into the teaching profession. National professional accreditation is under way. The philanthropic foundations have supported experimentation liberally. The federal government has greatly increased its subsidization of teacher education through the special programs of the National Science Foundation and the U. S. Office of Education.

---

[6] National Education Association and American Association of School Administrators, Educational Policies Commission. *The Central Purpose of American Education.* Washington, D. C.: the Commission, 1961.

Moreover, it looks as though a consensus is developing with respect to the major elements of a teacher education program. The excellent statement by the National Council of Independent Schools in May 1958,[7] the Ford Foundation-sponsored experimental programs reported by Woodring in *New Directions in Teacher Education* in 1957,[8] the recommendations in Chapter 4 of the *New Horizons* report,[9] all stress the same major elements and envision five-year programs for preservice preparation. The proponents of the liberal arts recognize the appropriateness of a limited amount of pedagogical theory and an extended internship; the professional educators are recommending increases in subject matter preparation of teachers at all levels. I am afraid we have only scratched the surface in the clarification of basic philosophy and the determination of essential content for teacher education, but at least we appear to be scratching in more nearly the same places than formerly.

---

[7] National Council of Independent Schools, Committee on Teacher Training. *Preparation of Teachers for Secondary Schools.* Boston: the Council, 1958.

[8] Woodring, Paul. *New Directions in Teacher Education.* New York: Fund for the Advancement of Education, 1957.

[9] National Education Association, National Commission on Teacher Education and Professional Standards. *New Horizons for the Teaching Profession.* Washington, D. C.: the Commission, 1961.

A good deal is stirring. And yet I see no likelihood that a projection of our present effort into the next twenty years will bring about the kind of excellence we seek. We simply are not marshaling the resources necessary to do the job. What, then, needs to be done? I will suggest three imperatives for responsible leaders, relating to finance, research, and scholarship.

THREE MAJOR TASKS

Task Number 1: We must deal realistically with the financing of education as a problem of priorities in resource allocation.

We educators often look upon financial support of schools in schoolboy-allowance terms, appealing essentially to the generosity of the voters or state legislators. It is time we recognize that education must compete with other "economic goods" for the use of scarce resources.

The American people direct the allocation of resources in the private sector of our economy by their purchases of goods and services and in the public sector largely by the action of their elected representatives in deciding upon government expenditures. Increasingly, the major decisions as to what is needful for the general welfare are made by the Congress: 50 billion dollars annually for defense, 50 billion dollars for superhighways, liberal extension of government credit after the war to assure a strong flow of lumber, steel, and labor into private housing, and so on. But determination of the general level of support for education has not been considered a function of the Congress. It is the business of the states and localities.

Decisions are made in state legislatures and in local school elections largely in terms of local considerations and in the light of prior claims made by the federal government. In effect, resources which might be steered into education have been preempted for other purposes. How familiar is the "We love you, but . . ." response from state legislators. They believe in education; they often feel that appropriate requests are justified, but they do not have additional funds at their disposal; and they are not inclined to make substantial increases in taxes, partly because of the high level of federal taxation and partly because of the competitive disadvantage experienced by the state or locality which steps out ahead of its neighbors in this respect. Moreover, local school boards and state legislators are not held responsible for the vital national problem of resource allocation. *Nowhere is the question of the relative importance of education in our society and its relation to the general strength and welfare of our nation faced explicitly.*

In spite of the fact that expenditures in education have more than doubled in the last ten years, we need a further major increase in investment in education. We are now spending about three and one-half percent of our gross national product for formal education at all levels. I would accept as conservative the estimate in the Rockefeller Brothers Report that it will take at least five percent of a greatly increased GNP to meet the quantitative demands and make much-needed qualitative improvements by 1970.[10] To reach that level we would have to make a basic decision as a nation to give definitely higher priority to education in the allocation of our resources. I believe the American people feel they have made a tremendous effort and given education a high priority in the last decade (and they have at the local level), but actually, we have not increased the proportion of GNP *per pupil* invested in education in this country during this period. We have done little more than simply ride the wave of expanding GNP.

As I see it, the problem is not one of simply getting a federal "handout." What is needed is to fix continuing responsibility for the general level of educational support. Here we face a paradox. We purport to believe that education is supremely important, too important, we say, to trust to Washington; it must be kept close to the people. But under modern conditions our desire to have the local community determine the form, content, and support of public education, to the extent we now do, may well prove to be an Achilles heel rather than a source of strength.

The fiscal problem is not apt to be solved until it is viewed realistically. There are many possible mechanisms, such as direct federal grants, scholarships, extension of credit, provision of income tax credits for increases in personal and corporate taxes levied locally for support of education. I recommend no specific solution. I simply urge that those of us here and elsewhere who bear leadership responsibilities recognize this problem of school finance as essentially one of priorities in resource allocation, that we recognize the peculiar position in which education now finds itself—at "second table," so to speak—and that we assist the custodians of local control to understand this situation lest loyalty to traditions of localism prevent our finding an imaginative solution. Only if we solve this problem will we have the means to attain a high order of excellence throughout our educational system.

---

[10] Rockefeller Brothers Fund, Inc. *The Pursuit of Excellence.* Panel Report V of the Special Studies Project. New York: Doubleday & Co., Inc., 1958.

See also: Committee for Economic Development. *Paying for Better Public Schools.* December 1959, esp. pp. 86-89, where the Committee presents much more conservative estimates but, in my judgment, makes grossly inadequate provisions for qualitative improvements in public education.

For an excellent treatment of the general rationale of public school support, see: Benson, Charles. *The Economics of Public Education.* Boston: Houghton Mifflin Co., 1961.

Task Number 2: We must learn to evaluate teacher education programs on the basis of the results they produce.

In his chapter on evaluation in *New Directions in Teacher Education,* Paul Woodring points out:

> Programs of teacher education may be evaluated at any one of three levels: we can make judgments about the program itself, we can judge the competence of the teachers who graduate from the program, or we can evaluate the learning of the children taught by these teachers. The third alternative is the only one that really gets to the heart of the problem for no program of teacher education is good unless it produces teachers who can contribute to effective learning in children.[11]

To an overwhelming extent we evaluate at the first level only, simply by seeing to what extent a program includes procedures or elements we assume to be valuable. If we want excellence, we had better begin to look more systematically at results.

---

[11] Woodring, Paul. *op. cit.*, p. 62.

Let us consider three situations where this matter has an important bearing.

1. *Reliance on studies of opinion and practice.*

I shall take as an example the study published by the American Association of Teachers Colleges in 1948 under the title *School and Community Laboratory Experiences in Teacher Education,*[12] better known as the "Flowers Report." I use this example deliberately, because it has been one of the most influential studies in teacher education; and there is no reason to believe that its major recommendations were not basically sound.

The Flowers Report set forth a list of principles constituting the Committee's initial conceptions, reported widespread agreement therewith among practitioners largely from the student teaching field, cited practices considered good, and made a set of recommendations based on the original principles and observation of practices in accord with those principles. The report thus represented an effective summary of the beliefs of the laboratory experience people, but it provided no direct evidence that programs based on its recommendations would develop more effective teachers than programs based on different, or even contrary, principles. For example, there is no evidence that the time required to provide the prospective teacher "opportunity for responsible participation in all of the major activities of today's teacher," including work with children, parents, colleagues, and community agencies, could not better be used in strengthening his subject matter competence or his grasp of educational theory.

---

[12] American Association of Teachers Colleges, Committee on Standards and Surveys (John G. Flowers, Chairman). *School and Community Laboratory Experiences in Teacher Education.* Washington, D. C.: the Association, a department of the National Education Association, 1948.

The Committee on Standards and Surveys did not claim to have proved the efficacy of experiences organized in accordance with its recommendations, but neither did it feel any compulsion to point out that such evidence was lacking. And in practice the recommendations were widely accepted among us as definitive, partly no doubt because the Committee argued cogently, but also partly, I believe, because we have become so greatly impressed with normative surveys and opinion polls, particularly if we conduct them.

This procedure was considered good in its day—a landmark—but excellence demands more rigorous research in the future.

2. *Lack of achievement testing at the end of teacher preparation programs.*

We go to great lengths to devise general education programs, to determine requirements for major and minor fields, and to develop a professional sequence, but we make precious little effort to find out what results we are achieving. Experience two years ago with testing programs developed by the Educational Testing Service for this purpose revealed the norms to be shockingly inadequate, principally because so few colleges participated.

Furthermore, even those institutions which do make systematic efforts to judge the level of achievement of their graduates seldom do so in terms of gains. We are quite content to rely on status measures which reflect both selection and training; seldom do we seek to isolate achievement which may legitimately be considered the result of specific educational experiences under our direction, rather than the result of previous learning or general maturity. We might find some interesting bugs in this box if we opened the lid.

3. *Accreditation of programs by judging procedures rather than results.*

In our accrediting processes we check on form of organizations, curriculum patterns, student teaching arrangements, formal qualifications of staff, courses taken by students (not what they *learned* but what they *took*), and so on. And in many instances we simply check to see whether or not a form or process is followed, not how effectively it is utilized. To our credit, we do secure measures of the quality of students admitted and retained, as judged by high school rank and aptitude tests. And I understand that more recently the NCATE has been requesting specific evidence regarding the scholastic achievement of graduates. I think it is fair to say, however, that an institution could meet all the formal requirements and yet be doing a mediocre job of preparing teachers. And another institution might deviate from the stipulated forms to a considerable extent and still be getting good results. Hence, it is extremely important that we cooperate in, and encourage the extension of, the efforts of the National Council and the regionals to secure direct evidence of the quality of results achieved by our students.

If these readily observable forms and procedures were known to be necessary and sufficient conditions for obtaining high quality results, we might justifiably rely on a review of such characteristics. But such is not generally the case. In fact, it is because we lack acceptable criterion measures and basic research data on the relation between procedures and outcomes that we rely on subjectively determined descriptive standards.

Let me remind you that it is not the job of the National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education nor of the regional accrediting association to do basic research. It is up to us: the institutions and organizations we represent. But do you hear many proposals for hard-headed, lay-it-on-the-line evaluation these days? We seldom seem to think of arranging for an independent evaluation by persons not committed to our hypotheses, of a deliberate search for negative evidence, of thoughtful consideration of hostile opinion. What do we think of? Find out what is being done, survey opinion within the fraternity, establish pilot centers, hold a workshop or conference, issue a bulletin; these are our responses to practically any problem. Frankly, they sound more like a sales campaign than a search for evidence.

I believe we face a special hazard in teacher education because of the wide variety of institutions offering programs and because of the peculiar historical development of teacher education with its split between "educationists" and "academicians." We may get orthodoxies elevated to the status of standards backed by sanctions where insistence on a particular form or process becomes a matter of "loyalty" to the profession or to the liberal arts tradition. In the absence of evidence, we may find ourselves settling these matters through a power struggle.

My point, then, is: even though research relating teacher preparation to teaching performance is extremely difficult and can never in itself be conclusive, we who have leadership responsibilities should work hard to build gradually a stock of verifiable knowledge on which we can base standards in the drive for excellence in teacher education. In the meantime, we should certainly strive to supplement our description of forms and procedures with qualitative judgments as to their effectiveness and with as much evidence as we can get on outcomes.

Some encouraging signs are on the research front. By working steadily for ten years David Ryans has helped lay the groundwork through his identification of characteristics of teachers.[13] John Beery's recent study of the effectiveness of emergency teachers in Florida comes as a breath of fresh air.[14] Dean Beery compared the effectiveness of teachers who held emergency certificates because of lack of required courses in education with that of teachers comparable in other respects who had taken the required education courses. He found that "completion of the professional sequence of education courses is reflected in more effective teaching, at least during the first year of teaching." His study has distinct limitations, I believe, but the significant point is that he made an honest stab at a "second-level" approach, using trained observers to judge the work of teachers on the job. The measures of teaching competence used do not, in my judgment, give sufficient weight to the content of what was taught; a teacher could be friendly, systematic, stimulating, and using approved techniques (these were the characteristics evaluated) and still be teaching nonsense to the children. Nevertheless, Dean Beery has made a scholarly analysis and published a complete and highly readable report, so that each of us may judge the signficance of the study for himself. This strikes me as far superior to the usual run of claims, counterclaims, and most of what passes for research in our field. Also, I note that about one-half of the experimenters sponsored by the Ford Fund are seeking to make second-level evaluations, and two or three are attempting to go to the third level by measuring pupil outcomes. I have not seen detailed results, but the fact that attempts are being made is heartening.

---

[13] Ryans, David G. *Characteristics of Teachers.* Washington, D. C.: American Council on Education, 1960.

[14] Beery, John R. *Professional Preparation and Effectiveness of Beginning Teachers.* Coral Gables: Graphic Arts Press, University of Miami, 1960.

We should not expect results soon in this quarter; this is part of the "long look" that Dr. Hunt always advises. But, as we move on to consider a third major task, I submit that unless, in our research, in our institutional self-evaluation, in our accreditation, and throughout our total teacher education effort, we look more critically at outcomes than we have in the past, we will find ourselves prominent among those "talking about excellence who aren't going there."

Task Number 3: We must place much greater stress on scholarly analysis of content.

I believe our greatest weakness in education and teacher education is failure to recognize the importance and extreme complexity of the job of determining *content:* what to teach in any given situation. The educationist tends to undervalue, the academician, to oversimplify this problem. To put it bluntly, I believe many elementary and secondary school teachers do an extremely ingenious job of leading their students to master misinformation and trivia. Moreover, the cruciality of this matter and the need for a high degree of teacher competence have been greatly increased by (a) the trend toward local curriculum building, (b) the effort to have students use a variety of sources rather than a textbook, and (c) the use of units of instruction (often teacher-prepared).

I well remember an incident reported by Ernest Horn to his graduate students at Iowa in the mid-1930's. He invited Frank Vanderlip, a leading New York banker, to visit an elementary school classroom where the culminating activity of a unit on banking was in process. As they left the classroom, Dr. Horn asked the eminent Mr. Vanderlip what he thought of what he had observed. "Amazing!" was the reply. "Never in such a short space of time have I heard so many incorrect statements regarding banking."

Consider the problem. How well equipped is the typical elementary teacher to know what the most significant ideas are for his students to retain regarding Bolivia, for example, or modern Egypt, or, to be difficult, modern Cuba? In the limited time at their disposal, what ought high schools to stress regarding tariffs, or the United Nations, or atomic energy, or *The Merchant of Venice,* or civil liberties, or the Reformation? The teacher needs the help of scholars and must be equipped to use it.

I consider the most promising educational development of the postwar period to be the work of scholars on the elementary and secondary curriculum. Potshots at the weaknesses of the schools, though salutary at times, are not enough. The sleeves must be rolled up, as has been done by the Physical Science Study Committee stemming from Massachusetts Institute of Technology, by the School Mathematics Study Group centered at Yale and mathematicians from the University of Illinois, by the American Institute of Biological Sciences in developing the Biological Sciences Curriculum Study, and by the Modern Language Association in its work on the preparation of teachers.

I would offer the following observations regarding this development.

1. Top scholars are required to do this job: broad-gauge men of unquestioned scholarship and philosophical bent, who see their disciplines in perspective. Run-of-the-mill college professors do not have the depth and breadth of insight to make the appropriate judgments.

2. Teachers should work with scholars in the academic disciplines and in professional education to make necessary adaptations for school use.

3. What starts out to be solely a matter of content quickly splashes over into methods and materials, revealing how false at bottom is the dichotomy between "what to teach" and "how to teach." The Woods Hole report by Jerome Bruner, *The Process of Education,* is particularly enlightening with respect to implications for methodology

to be found in the "structure of the disciplines."[15]

4. Merely to determine the content of specific courses is not enough; we need to bring the best brains of the country to bear on the analysis of appropriate content for the entire span of the student's years in school.

5. The National Science Foundation Institutes in Science and Mathematics have demonstrated a feasible method for bringing the work of scholars to large numbers of teachers. A substantial investment is required, of course, but we ought to be making that kind of investment in the humanities and the social sciences at the present time.

Finally, we must not permit the scholars to abdicate again as they did when the secondary school population began to change some fifty years ago. We must recognize that with the rapid growth of knowledge considerations of content are crucial; and we must insist that leading scholars continue to accept responsibility for determining "what knowledge is of most worth."

Reliance on the scholars alone will not suffice, however. We who educate teachers must be so thoroughly cognizant of the overwhelming importance of content and the inherent relationship between content and method that we see to it that the teachers we prepare understand the significance of the decisions they make from day to day as to what to stress, are sufficiently competent in their teaching fields to apply the work of scholars, and accept their responsibility to keep abreast of developing knowledge in their fields. Only thus will we have a chance of achieving excellence in the degree needed.

---

[15] Bruner, Jerome S. *The Process of Education.* Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1960.

CONCLUSION

In conclusion, I suggest that we nail to our masthead Mr. Gardner's imperative: *Excellence in a context of concern for all.* United in this endeavor, let us strive to see that the total educational enterprise is allocated resources commensurate with the magnitude of the challenge our society faces; let us work hard to judge teacher education programs by the results they achieve; and let us enlist our best scholarship in the never-ending task of determining what to teach.

And now back to Charles W. Hunt. In closing, I can do no better than to quote his words of two years ago when he acknowledged the inauguration of this lecture series. As we strive for excellence to match complexity, let us hold fast to "enduring faith in our purposes, faith in our fellow workers, and faith in the democratic tradition and process."[16]

---

[16] American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education. *Thirteenth Yearbook.* Washington, D. C.: the Association, 1960. p. 8.

AFRICA, TEACHER EDUCATION, AND THE UNITED STATES

KARL W. BIGELOW

THE FOURTH CHARLES W. HUNT LECTURE

Presented at the Fifteenth Annual Meeting of
the American Association of Colleges
for Teacher Education
Chicago, Illinois
February 13, 1963

80/81

Karl Worth Bigelow is a native of Maine, born in Bangor on May 10, 1898. He obtained his bachelor's degree at Clark University and his Ph.D. from Harvard. Educated as an economist, he has made important contributions in the field of teacher education, and has taught at Radcliffe, Harvard, Teachers College, Columbia University, and the University of London, College of Education. Dr. Bigelow retired from active professorship of higher education at Teachers College, Columbia University, where he first came as visiting professor of education

in 1937, to assume his present position as professor emeritus and director of the Anglo-Afro-American Program. He holds membership in a number of professional associations and honorary societies; among these are:
Phi Beta Kappa, Kappa Delta Pi, Phi Delta Kappa, National Education Association, and American Association of School Administrators.

For many years Dr. Bigelow has directed his notable career in teacher education toward ever-widening cooperation on national and international levels. From 1945-50 he was chairman of the Council on Cooperation in Teacher Education. In France in 1947 he was lecturer and consultant at the UNESCO Seminar on Education for International Understanding. He was director of a seminar on education and training of teachers in England in 1948 and member of the U.S. National Commission for UNESCO 1948-54. He was chairman of the National Conference of Christians and Jews 1949-50, as well as vice-chairman of the Commission on Occupied Areas in 1949-50.

In 1950 he was chairman of a committee sent by the Department of State to study relations of American volunteer agencies with Germany and Austria. In 1952 he had already evidenced interest in Africa as a student of higher education and teacher training in British Africa under the auspices of the British Colonial Office, University of London, Institute of Education and Inter-University Council on Higher Education in the Colonies. From 1958 on he has been a member of the Commission on Educational Policy in Africa of the World Confederation of

Organizations of the Teaching Profession (WCOTP).

He was a delegate of the AACTE to the American Council on Education 1951-56, AACTE institutional representative at Teachers College, Columbia University 1951-59, a member of the Committee on Studies 1954-60, and a member of the AACTE-AAAS Joint Commission on the Education of Teachers of Science and Mathematics. He also worked with Dr. Hunt on the Commission of Teacher Education of the American Council on Education, of which Dr. Bigelow was director 1938-44, and is presently vice-chairman of its Overseas Liaison Committee.

AFRICA, TEACHER EDUCATION, AND THE UNITED STATES

BY KARL W. BIGELOW

THE FOURTH CHARLES W. HUNT LECTURE

I have chosen to direct your attention this evening to a distant part of the world. I have done so for a variety of reasons. In the first place, in recent years, teacher education in Africa has been my dominant preoccupation, and like everyone else I am inclined to talk about what I find most exciting. In the second place, the new nations of Africa have declared the expansion and improvement of their educational institutions to be their major need, and have recognized that the development and strengthening of teacher education are most essential if that need is to be met—a stand which would seem bound to stir the interest and sympathy of this gathering. Finally, Africa increasingly looks to this country for help in the solution of its educational problems, and will do so even more vigorously for years to come. There is no institution represented here that might not share in America's response to Africa's requests for help. I should like to urge that all seek to respond, and at the same time suggest how such help can be provided most wisely.

Ten years ago only four countries in the whole vast African continent were independent. The rest were colonial dependencies of Great Britain, France, Belgium, Portugal, and Spain. Ten years ago most Americans knew little about Africa, and had no particular interest in learning more. Ten years ago American aid to African education was virtually limited to the activities of certain missionary bodies, plus a little pioneer work by a foundation or two, and some exchange of persons provided for by the U. S. Department of State.

I have mentioned these facts together because radical change in the political status of Africa led to radical change in American knowledge about Africa, and in American assistance to its educational institutions.

Since the middle 50's, freedom has come to country after country in Africa with a speed that few had foreseen. Today most African nations are free, others stand clearly upon the threshold of freedom, and no competent observer believes that the remainder can remain otherwise. As these nations (they now number thirty-two) won their independence they were admitted to the United Nations with significant consequences for the balance of international power. With the new nations of Asia they have formed a "neutralist" third power, declining to tie themselves firmly either to the West or to the East. Their avowed position is that they want to be friends with everybody, are prepared to learn from everybody, will welcome help from everybody, but have no intention of becoming anybody's satellite.

Independence is a wonderful thing, but it does not solve all of a nation's problems automatically, as our own history demonstrates. More specifically, it does not automatically bring national prosperity in its wake. One major problem is how to create a unified, stable, efficiently operating national society; another is how to increase national productivity and raise national standards of living from the existing pitifully low bases; and a third is how to expand and improve national systems of education.

As a matter of fact, and it must be to us a fascinating fact, Africa sees the solution of her educational problems as essential to the solution of the rest. The new nations of Africa are assigning their highest priorities to the enlargement and betterment of educational institutions. Professional educators like ourselves can hardly fail to agree that this shows great intelligence!

How has this come about? To begin with, the people of Africa, even before the coming of independence, had become convinced that there was a relationship between education and personal and national well-being. They had observed that the Europeans who governed them and who lived at an enviable standard of comfort were highly educated. They had observed also that their own countrymen who had been able to obtain a high level of education commanded high-level jobs and prospered. The inference seemed obvious.

But there is more to the matter than that. At about the same time that Africa began to achieve its independence, some influential American and European economists set forth the theory that variations in national per capita productivity, difficult to explain in other terms, became understandable if the influence of differences in average national educational levels were taken into account. Education, it was consequently argued, was a form of capital creation, the capital being human rather than material. This was a view with which the Russians and the Chinese were prepared to agree, as their policies of massive educational development in the interest of increasing national productivity testified.

This line of reasoning implies, of course, that national educational development should be deliberately keyed to national manpower needs as revealed by national economic planning. Moreover, this implication was explicitly acted upon by the Ashby Commission, which issued its influential report on the future of higher education in Nigeria in the fall of 1960. This report, significantly titled *Investment in Education*, built its whole argument on the basis of a survey of prospective Nigerian manpower needs.

Within a few months after the appearance of the Ashby report, the new African Ministers of Education met together for the first time, at a conference called in Addis Ababa by UNESCO, and endorsed and embraced the investment-in-education line of reasoning. They recommended that all African countries establish national economic planning bodies, including provision for continuous manpower studies. National educational planning bodies should also be established to start working towards the recommendations contained in those studies. Education should be "for use," not for adornment, to employ Francis Bacon's phrase, and scientific and technical training should receive the lion's share of attention. Last fall's UNESCO-sponsored Conference at Tananarive on the Development of Higher Education in Africa (the one at Addis Ababa had embraced the whole system) accepted and built on all these fundamental positions.

The Ashby report declared (and the position was fully supported at Addis Ababa and Tananarive) that the highest priority for expansion of African education was at the secondary school level, to be followed at the level of higher education. All realize that none of this can happen effectively without a great, swift increase in the available numbers of competent secondary school and university teachers. Therefore, in a very real sense, the expansion of facilities for teacher education, both at university and lower levels, emerges as the highest priority of all. What we are unanimously convinced of thus is impressively asserted: an adequate supply of competent, well-prepared teachers is the cornerstone of the educational temple.

How is a swift and massive increase in this supply to be obtained? In the long run, mainly by expansion of facilities for the preparation of African teachers in Africa. The responsibility of the universities there is crucial for speeding up the production of teachers for the secondary schools and institutions of higher education. The most urgent need, stated by the Tananarive report, is "to increase the flow of graduates into the teaching profession. . . ." The universities are straining to increase their student capacity, and are beginning to introduce undergraduate degrees in education, as the Ashby Commission urged. This last step represents a turning from the established British practice towards an American one, although it should be quickly added that a similar innovation is now being recommended within the United Kingdom itself.

Heavy emphasis in Africa is laid also on the necessity for an increase in the number, size, and quality of non-degree-granting "training colleges" where teachers are prepared for the primary and, especially, the lower forms in the secondary schools. Since the majority of all teachers currently employed are far from meeting even the most modest standards of qualification, the need for vigorous programs of in-service education is recognized. At this point, the role of the university institute of education receives special stress.

Progress towards the goal of maximizing the production of African teachers in Africa promises to be considerable. The supply of young men and women qualified for admission to training colleges and universities, however, still is relatively small, and can be increased only so fast. There is a limit to the rate at which such institutions can be created or expanded, and the competitive advantages of other important professions are bound to take their toll, especially in the case of university graduates. Moreover, expansion of the facilities of universities and training colleges raises problems of how they are to be adequately manned.

A second possible way to increase the supply of competent African teachers is to send abroad those qualified for high-level training for whom places cannot be found currently in African educational institutions. This is being done, and probably will continue increasing in the case of candidates for the bachelor's degree or for higher degrees and certificates. However, there are some very delicate aspects to this procedure. The African universities, with some reason, fear that the provision of study opportunities overseas may slow down their own development or, at least, drain away some of their ablest student prospects. At Tananarive it sometimes appeared that Africa was saying to the rest of the world, "Please stop luring our young men and women away from us." Younger and less well-established American colleges and universities that have seen some of their best freshman prospects lured to older and more prestigious institutions by scholarship awards will easily understand such an attitude. When all the evidence was in, however, it became clear that a steady increase in study opportunities for Africans outside their own continent was desired for the next decade, provided they could be distributed in such a way as to avoid interference with local institution-building.

Let us suppose that all young Africans suited for preparation as teachers could be offered such preparation, either at home or abroad. Their numbers would still fall far short of those required for expansion of African secondary schools, training colleges, technical institutes, and universities, according to the Addis Ababa and Tananarive schedules. The inescapable conclusion, reached and accepted by Africa itself, is that during at least fifteen to twenty years a third method must be employed to meet Africa's need. There must be a sharp increase in the importation of teachers, "expatriate teachers," as they are called, from non-African countries. This is the reason for more French teachers in the former French colonies of Africa today than at the time those countries gained their freedom. It also explains why the British Ministry of Education's plan is designed to encourage experienced British teachers to spend several years in Africa with the assurance of reappointment upon their return without sacrifice of salary status, retirement accumulations, or other perquisites. It explains the heavy African demands upon the Peace Corps for secondary school teachers. It explains also why the Anglo-Afro-American Program for Teacher Education has recruited, selected, and in all cases specially trained in less than two years (though usually in collaboration with British or African universities) over four hundred Americans for teaching service in Africa.

Which brings me to the second and most important part of this talk: a systematic consideration of the ways in which American colleges for teacher education can share most effectively in helping to meet Africa's tremendous and compelling educational needs. I hope that what I have already said has persuaded you, if you needed any persuasion, that to share in providing such help would be a worthy enterprise. I can assure you that the government of the United States has no doubt about this matter: the prospering of the new African nations is a matter in which our government is deeply interested. Through the Department of State, the Agency for International Development, the Peace Corps, and, less directly, the United Nations, UNESCO, and other international agencies, the United States is seeking to do its part to help Africa advance. Furthermore, it accepts and approves the African conviction that improvement of African education is a prime essential. The great American foundations also agree and are steadily increasing their benefactions in the interest of Africa, as are other private agencies, the churches, universities, and colleges, and certain business corporations, through the provision of scholarships and fellowships.

Financial support will not be lacking. However, the essential need of African education is for skilled, devoted services. Those must be provided by people, and where should we look for needed people sooner than to America's colleges for teacher education?

If you will think back on what I have been saying, you will see at once that the needs of African education are of three kinds: first, for educational opportunities for Africans preparing to become teachers; second, for Americans prepared to serve effectively as secondary school teachers in Africa; and third, for staffing and other forms of assistance to African training colleges and university departments and institutes of education.

I propose to discuss each of these needs in order, and how we may best help in meeting each. First, however, I want to make some statements applicable to all. My main concern is to emphasize that we had better stay out of Africa competely if we are neither willing nor able to do a first-rate job. Africa is looking to us for our best, and a "missionary-barrel response" will be instantly spotted and bitterly resented. A *desire* to do a first-rate job is not enough. We need to have a complete knowledge of Africa and the African situation if our behavior is to be effectively instrumental to our purposes.

Moreover, we should avoid like the plague any pedagogically messianic delusions. Africa not only has no intention of taking over any other country's educational ideas and practices wholesale, but it has considerable skepticism about many aspects of American education. Indeed, in very large degree Africa is pretty well satisfied with the European educational ideas and practices with which it is familiar. It will eventually, of course, create its own educational patterns, and it is prepared to pick up cues from any quarter. But our American efforts to contribute had better be marked by humility, modesty, and adaptability. Incidentally, this will make our experience all the more educational!

What do we do, therefore, about Africans coming to this country to be prepared for teaching? In the first place, we make certain that we know what we are doing when we grant admission to African students. They should be individuals who are properly prepared to meet our standards of academic accomplishment and who have the backing of appropriate authorities in their own countries. The African Scholarship Program of American Universities is doing a steadily improving job of helping in these respects, and there are other ways as well of getting assurance concerning the problems of admission.

In the second place, we should understand that there will be special problems for Africans coming to us to be prepared for teaching—and we should be ready and able to provide special help with those problems. The first task will be to help our African students get used to the United States, the institutions in which they find themselves as students, and the educational system to which our professional courses are geared and in which they prepare students to teach. Next, we should be alert for a tendency on the part of students to decide that teaching is not their métier after all and that they should shift to a major in International Relations and get ready for an ambassadorship. Finally, we need to protect them from any inclination to swallow whole the American educational mystique. Instead, we should ensure that they realistically and critically consider the applicability of all they observe and are told in this country to the developing circumstances of their own.

These will not be easy accomplishments. They are most likely to be attained, in my opinion, on campuses: (1) where a considerable number of able American students are enthusiastically preparing for teaching careers; (2) where there are staff members with a firsthand knowledge of African educational situations; and (3) where the number of Africans preparing for teaching is sufficient to justify provision for their special guidance.

One point remains to be made. After reasonable allowance of time for African students to get their American sea-legs (with provision of help), their achievement should be appraised by the same standards applied to everyone else. If admission procedures have been intelligent and informed, this should present no problem. We must certainly stop supporting the notion (far from unknown in Africa) that anybody can get an American degree. To put it in other and better terms, we must be sure that any African returning to his own country from the United States as a teacher can deliver what his country needs.

How about our job of helping produce American "expatriate" teachers for the secondary schools of Africa? Here the potential contributions that you, and the institutions you represent, can make are of two sorts: all of you can help recruit; and some of you may help provide for special training.

As for recruitment, let me begin by recognizing that Americans who offer to devote two or more years of their lives to Africa are likely to be marked by certain characteristics that have little directly to do with a vocation for teaching: an interest in far places; a passion for adventure; and footlooseness. On the other hand, we might expect that the teacher's drive to be of service to children would not stop at national boundaries. At any rate it seems to be a proposition likely to appeal to you that that the ideal American export to a teaching position in Africa would be someone who combined suitable general qualities with established teaching competence. Beyond that you would certainly agree, or I hope you would, that no American should be sent to teach African children who was not acceptable as a teacher of children in this country. I should prefer to say "in the best secondary schools of this country."

The fact is that top-quality, experienced teachers and top-quality, professionally-prepared, though inexperienced, teachers are not coming forward in notable numbers. To put it another way, they are being outnumbered, among all who are offering themselves for teaching service in Africa, by college graduates who lack professional preparation. Colleges like yours can help this situation, if an active interest is aroused. How? By encouraging outstanding recent graduates who have become teachers and outstanding seniors preparing for teaching to volunteer for education service in Africa. You might even find that the prospect of an opportunity to teach in Africa would provide a special stimulus to lowerclassmen to enter your program of teacher education. Since there are a variety of recruiting agencies at work, of which the Peace Corps and Teachers for East Africa are only the best known, it would be most helpful if some faculty member on each of your campuses were fully informed about all alternatives and able to provide guidance to your graduates and undergraduates as they seek to discover opportunities that best would suit their particular talents and interests.

There is pretty widespread agreement by now that Americans going to Africa as teachers need special preparatory training, although there are still differences of opinion as to the proper length and content of such training programs. I myself have had connections with ten different programs, and on the basis of that experience have reached certain conclusions. It seems evident that all Americans who are going to teach in Africa need to know something about the continent and country to which they are proceeding: the history, geography, economics, politics, sociology, literature, music, art, and the like. They particularly need to receive a fairly detailed introduction to the educational system of which they are to become a part: what its purposes are; how it is organized; what the pupils are like; what curriculums are usual, and what teaching methods are customarily employed; for what examinations students should be prepared; what a teacher's duties and life entail. An introduction to the techniques of teaching in English, children for whom English is a second language is very important, and some instruction in a local language will certainly be helpful. Advice on how to live comfortably and in good health in African communities is indispensable. A review of those aspects of American culture about which Africans are likely to raise searching questions will be useful indeed.

This is not a particularly small order, and if it is to be delivered effectively, it calls for the services of a highly expert staff. The Peace Corps and TEA volunteers that I have observed gave highest marks to instructors who knew Africa from the inside and demonstrated an enthusiastic interest in the work that was to be undertaken by those whom they were teaching.

In my judgment, a group of professionally prepared American teachers (with or without regular teaching experience) can be prepared for work in Africa, along the lines I have been recommending, and by instructors possessing the requisite special competences, in training programs of about six to eight weeks.

How about young Americans who come forward without professional preparation for teaching? These now constitute the majority of all volunteers; and in all important characteristics except established professional competence they rank high. Under the Teachers for East Africa Program such persons are sent to Makerere College in Uganda for a full academic year of study side-by-side with African and British graduates, in order that they may earn Makerere's diploma in education. On the basis of this diploma they are unhesitatingly recognized as "qualified teachers" by the governments of East Africa. The Afro-Anglo-American Program, jointly conducted by Teachers College, Columbia University and the University of London Institute of Education, is also a full academic year's duration. Both are professionally conservative operations.

The Peace Corps, on the other hand, argues that highly motivated volunteers can, in intense training programs of high quality, be raised to a tolerable level of professional competence in a shorter period of time. My own observations have led me to conclude that if the volunteers are of high general ability and have been well prepared in the subjects they are to teach, it should be possible to prepare them to begin teaching in Africa in programs of about twelve to fifteen weeks. I am certain, however, that it will require much further experimentation before we learn how to do this job with high efficiency.

Those who offer themselves as teachers for Africa without professional preparation tend to be skeptical of the need for such preparation. Many of them are oriented more to Africa than to teaching, and are in a hurry to get overseas and to the teaching job, which they assume will turn out to be pretty easy. They do respond to what seems to them to be practical instruction (including opportunities for student teaching) and to lectures with a high intellectual content, but they tend to be very critical of anything that strikes them as obvious, long-winded, or woolly. They offer quite a challenge, and any of you that plan to take them on had better mobilize your most impressive resources.

Before I leave the subject of American secondary teachers for Africa, I want to ask you to consider for a few moments the services that you may be able to render to them upon their return to the United States. . . . You will agree, I am sure, that it is much to be hoped that a large proportion of those returning will wish to continue as teachers in their own country. We need as many good teachers as we can find. And surely American children will benefit from being taught by men and women who have known Africa at first hand.

However, these men and women, and there will be thousands of them before we get through, will face some special problems with which many of the colleges for teacher education that you represent can be helpful. Let me speak particularly of two problems. First, many of these ex-teachers in Africa will wish to carry their professional studies further, and will raise questions with you as to the amount of academic recognition you will be prepared to give to the special training they were given in preparation for their work in Africa. You will find that some of the American universities and colleges that have conducted special training programs have awarded regular credit for the work done, and I presume you will be ready to accept this on a transfer basis. Where the training was carried out in part at African universities, you may find it more difficult to decide exactly what to do, but I think you will discover that some American institution was associated with the African one (as Teachers College has been with Makerere College, and Harvard with the University of Ibadan) and will be able to give you reliable advice.

A trickier problem relates to the returning teachers from Africa who had had no professional preparation before they volunteered for African teaching service. Some of these people, perhaps a considerable number, will have been led by their African experience to wish to make teaching their career. They are likely to feel that if they can produce evidence that they succeeded as teachers in Africa, they should not be required to spend much, if any, time learning how to teach before being permitted to start teaching in the United States. Only our state departments of education can decide what policy to adopt in this situation, and the case for immediate provisional certification, for example, will vary from individual to individual. Some will have strong subject matter backgrounds, others weak ones. Some will have gone through training programs preparatory to teaching in Africa in which the professional component will have been large; in other cases that component will have been virtually nonexistent. The point I want especially to make is that these teachers returning from Africa, eager to continue as teachers, deserve special consideration. To apply to them, mechanically, regulations established with regard to quite different categories of would-be teachers in this country would seem to me patently wrong. I believe we ought to be willing to take some risks in their case, checking up, of course, on how things work out, and modifying policy if things turn out badly. If you agree, I hope you will be willing to encourage state authorities to be generous in the case of these returning American teachers. I assume that they will need and want to pursue further professional study, but I hope that we shall not lose them as teachers for American children because of an inability to recognize that circumstances alter cases.

Let me turn, finally, to the third contribution that American colleges for teacher education may be expected to make to the cause of African education. This is a contribution by your own faculty members. Some of you already are doing this through contractual responsibilities for particular educational projects in Africa or through the release of individual teachers, but the demands are just beginning to build up. The Tananarive Conference estimated that English-speaking African universities will need to recruit nearly five thousand staff members overseas between now and 1980, and I have no doubt that that estimate is seriously inadequate. It is taken for granted that the chief sources must be Great Britain, Canada, Australia, New Zealand, and other Commonweath countries —and the United States of America. What proportion should and will be produced by this country is a matter of conjecture, but the demands are bound to be high.

Of all demands, those for teachers of education are certain to be particularly heavy. This can be inferred from the mounting emphasis on the prime responsibility of African universities to produce more teachers, from the increasing demands on university institutes of education to produce the research and provide the field services essential to African educational advance, and from the growing need of the expanding non-degree-granting teachers colleges for competent staff members.

We may be sure, therefore, that your colleges will be under greater and greater pressure to enable, and indeed encourage, members of your faculties to serve in Africa for periods of three to five years. Out of desperation Africa no doubt will have to agree to briefer appointments in some cases, but what is really needed are people willing to stay long enough to get their bearings and become genuine parts of the institutions to which they are attached. Efforts are now being made to develop machinery that will facilitate contacts between African and American institutions of higher education, encourage the latter to make some sacrifices in the interest of Africa's needs, and work out arrangements conducive to attracting American scholars to African posts. When that happens, I hope that America's colleges for teacher education will be the first to step forward.

And you will have selfish, as well as unselfish, reasons for doing so. In the long run, an American college teacher of education who has served for a season in Africa will find that he has acquired special valuable assets; and the American college or university to which he returns will make the same discovery.

I am, of course, an enthusiast. Although I try to allow for that idiosyncrasy, I always wind up believing that it must be self-evident that the challenge of African education to American education is one of the great emergent challenges of our day. Here is one of the great continents of the world, the homeland of the ancestors of one-tenth of all American citizens, suddenly free, suddenly a powerful factor in the international scene, determined to carve out its own destiny, temporarily dependent on fraternal help from elsewhere, convinced that education is the key to its future, turning to us for professional help to forge that key.

I am proud, I can tell you, of my young fellow-citizens who have grasped these realities and who have come forward to offer two or more years of their lives as teachers of the children of Africa. You, from whose colleges and universities they graduated, must be proud too; and you have a right to feel that their action is a tribute to the education they received at your hands.

But our task goes beyond the support of this splendid flow of Americans into professional service in Africa. We must receive more and more Africans as our students here, and we must ourselves go to Africa to serve its expanding universities and teachers colleges.

In all that we do, we must never waver in one determination: that the colleges for teacher education of America will give Africa nothing but their best.

THE CERTIFICATION OF TEACHERS: THE RESTRICTED STATE-APPROVED PROGRAM APPROACH

JAMES B. CONANT

❦

THE FIFTH CHARLES W. HUNT LECTURE

Presented at the Sixteenth Annual Meeting of
the American Association of Colleges
for Teacher Education
Chicago, Illinois
February 19, 1964

104/105

President emeritus of Harvard University, **James Bryant Conant** is a native of Massachusetts who was born in Dorchester on March 26, 1893, and he obtained his B.S., M.S., and Ph.D. degrees from Harvard. Educated as a scientist, he has contributed brilliantly in the four fields of science, statesmanship, writing, and education.

As a chemist he served as a major in the Army's Chemical Warfare Service during the first world war, and later, as a professor at Harvard, did outstanding research in the chemistry of organic compounds, especially his work on chlorophyll. In 1933, he was elected president of Harvard University and was responsible for bringing to the university many outstanding new professors and administrators, among them the distinguished architect Walter Gropius to Harvard's School of Architecture.

During the period of his presidency, Dr. Conant became more and more interested in the public schools. He saved Harvard's Graduate School of Education, which now ranks as one of the finest in the country, from an economy drive of the thirties, and in 1936 he ordered a new Harvard degree, Master of Arts in Teaching. From 1941 to 1963 he served five elected terms as a member of the Educational Policies Commission and in 1949 he suggested launching the National Citizens Commission for the Public Schools (which became the National Citizens Council for Better Schools).

During World War II, he played an important part in planning and organizing the top-secret Manhattan Project which developed the first atomic bomb. From 1941-46, he held the titles of chairman of the National Defense Research Committee and deputy director of the Office of Scientific Research and Development, and was a member of the General Advisory Committee of the Atomic Energy Commission, 1947-52.

Upon his retirement from the Harvard University presidency in 1953, Dr. Conant moved into the field of statesmanship. He represented this country as U.S. high commissioner for Germany from 1953-55 and from 1955-57 served as our ambassador to the Federal Republic of Germany.

On his return from Germany in 1957, Dr. Conant once more turned his notable talents to American education, this time to the public education system, beginning with a study of the American public high school, under a grant from the Carnegie Corporation. A result of this work was his well-known report published in 1959, *The American High School Today*. He also authored the subsequent and equally famous *Slums and Suburbs* in 1961 as well as *Education in the Junior High School Years*. His book *The Education of American Teachers* examined a slightly different area of the field and resulted from a study undertaken for the Carnegie Corporation of New York administered by the Educational Testing Service of Princeton, New Jersey. From 1963-65 he was educational advisor to the Ford Foundation in West Berlin, Germany. *The Comprehensive High School: A Second Report to Interested Citizens* concluded his Study of American Education in 1967.

Said the *Saturday Review* in October 1960: "If politics is the art of achieving the possible, and if statesmanship is the supreme achievement of the politician, James Bryant Conant can be accurately described as the number one educational statesman of our day."

THE CERTIFICATION OF TEACHERS: THE RESTRICTED STATE-APPROVED PROGRAM APPROACH

by James B. Conant

The Fifth Charles W. Hunt Lecture

I am going to consider this evening the various ways in which a state may endeavor to insure that the teachers in its public schools are well prepared and competent to teach. Whatever may be said of the related, but very different, problem of the states' power to insure quality instruction in private secular and religious schools, there is little doubt that the states possess the ultimate power to regulate the public schools and to determine the conditions of teacher employment.

THE STATE'S RESPONSIBILITY

Indeed, our perception of state power might be sharpened if we entertained for a moment the legally possible, though politically inconceivable, suggestion that local school boards be abolished and state systems set up. There are those so distressed at what is going on in many public schools (or perhaps at what is *not* going on) that they would favor this proposal. In such a system the teachers would be directly employed by the state and assigned to the different communities throughout the state. Such is essentially the arrangement now found in a number of foreign nations. One could argue that if school systems which educate as large a number of pupils as those of New York City or Chicago can function as a unit, or a system which covers as much territory as Dade County, Florida, can be centrally administered, there is no reason why a state cannot. Many state systems would in fact be smaller than these, and, in these days of rapid communication, the wide geographical distribution of inhabitants is hardly a sufficient basis for distinguishing between a state and a city system. Moreover, a case for such a system could be based on the desirability of insuring greater equality of educational opportunity. But I raise this hypothetical possibility merely to dramatize the nature of the state's responsibility. In this case what we now call "certification" would be perceived simply as the formulation of conditions which would have to be met before an individual could be appointed as a teacher.

For the purposes of after-dinner conversation, the merits and demerits of our American tradition of decentralized school administration is a suitable topic, but not for a serious discussion of realistic proposals for action. As I have often said, anyone who wishes to establish a state system where one does not now exist is welcome to the task of persuading the state legislature to abolish the local boards. I would ask only the opportunity of betting some money against the likelihood of the success of the reformer, and I would be willing to give long odds.

Taking the structure of American public education as it is (kindergarten through grade 12), we face the old, old question of what restrictions the state should place on the power of the local board, acting on the advice of its local superintendent, to hire teachers as it sees fit. As far as I am aware, no one has proposed, at least in recent years, to give the local boards full power. Rather the argument turns on what the restrictions should be, how rigorously they should be enforced, and who should formulate them.

Theoretically, of course, the ultimate power rests with the voters of each state. By the adoption of state constitutions, which can be changed only through difficult processes, this power has been delegated to state legislatures or other constitutional authorities. A number of legislatures, and in my judgment the wisest of them, have in turn delegated vast powers in regard to education to state boards, state officials, and local boards and officials.

I am frank to say that I think the more the legislature delegates its powers as regards education to responsible state boards and officials, the better. We have come to accept this sort of delegation with respect to our state universities, which in most cases are governed by boards of trustees or regents who have the ultimate power in appointing professors, and whose other powers differ from those of boards controlling private universities in two respects only: the legislature controls the purse strings and it, or other elected officials, can in time replace a board which has become unresponsive to the public interest. We now accept without thought the concept of a chartered board for higher education.

To my mind, the state legislatures should delegate power in matters affecting elementary and secondary education to a lay board or boards of education quite similar to the boards of trustees of state universities. These boards, having great power, should keep in close touch with the teaching profession *at all levels* and with the public. Only when such boards fail to maintain responsiveness to the public interest should they be replaced, and even in these cases the effort of elected public officials should be to seek more responsive boards and not to withdraw the power delegated. Let me emphasize my conviction that if the lay board or its professional staff permits itself to be captured by *any single* ideological or interest group it forfeits its right to represent the public on educational matters.

Of course, the boards do operate through professional staffs, headed by a chief state school officer; and when one speaks of a "state decision" or a "state regulation," he refers to a set of regulations or statement of policy promulgated by the board and the chief state school officer. One would hope that the state officer has a staff which can implement the decisions; and that the relations between the professional staff and the lay board permit effective action. I shall assume that conditions approaching the optimal exist, though of course they do not in every case. But the question of how to secure optimal conditions would take us into such controversial issues as the elected versus the appointed board, and the selection or appointment of the chief state school officers—issues which would lead us afield from my topic today. There is no way to speak rationally of any government operation without assuming rationality in the structure of government agencies and in the behavior of governing agents. So, in discussing teacher certification, I shall assume the existence of a responsible and effective state education agency. I certainly do not propose to prescribe the form of such agencies nor to evaluate the effectiveness of the boards and departments which now exist in the several states.

Since I have specified the state officials involved, you will not take it amiss if, from now on, I commit the error of misplaced concreteness by simply discussing the manner in which the "state" should behave. I shall discuss methods by which the state may restrict the power of local boards to appoint teachers, having already delegated to such boards the responsibility for employing teachers, for establishing salary schedules, and for regulating many other matters.

THE PRESCRIBED EXPOSURE APPROACH

The first method is the one now in existence in most, if not all, of the states. If one likes this approach, he might call it the "prescription of essential knowledge" method. If he does not, he will call it the "course-counting" method. If he is more or less committed to it, but fears its inflexibility or considers it inadequate as a total method, he will have incorporated its requirements as "guidelines" in an approved-programs system. In the latter case, whether or not the guidelines are rigorously applied will vary with the commitment of the approver and the strength of the college under consideration.

I would be inclined to call this system the "prescribed exposure" approach. If, of course, the same exposure to formal instruction in such fields as English or mathematics in all of the institutions of a state resulted in the same knowledge, these descriptions would mean the same thing. That such is not the case is one of the well known facts about American higher education.

I carry coals to Newcastle in arguing before the American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education that the "prescribed exposure" approach has not worked out well. Your organization, as well as such groups as the National Commission on Teacher Education and Professional Standards, have worked diligently for years to persuade the states to abandon this traditional method. Although I think some of your members have not followed to the logical conclusions of the argument, groups such as your have helped to expose the futility of the "prescribed exposure" approach. For example, you have pointed out that the mere listing of a course in a college catalog or in a state department regulation tells very little about the precise content or effectiveness of that course as taught on a particular college campus. You have also argued that teacher education is a rapidly changing and rapidly advancing field in which new patterns of organizing instruction are constantly being developed, and in which there is desperate need to innovate and experiment on individual college campuses. Some of you are even aware that those who would, for example, favor the near total elimination of courses in education have now discovered the possibility of using the state legislature to write prescriptions which would give them a captive student audience at the expense of the professors of education. For those of you who are not aware of this last point, I must warn you to expect even more powerful moves in this direction unless you can persuade the state officials that it is not their place to erect tariff barriers around the courses of any group of professors. But if you insist on using the political machinery of the state in your behalf, you must expect your opponents to do the same. Given the adoption of this tactic by the liberal arts professors as well as the professors of education, the *best* that can be hoped for is a kind of political horse trade by which, for example, a certain number of required credits in education are exchanged for a certain number of credits in chemistry. I find it hard to conceive that any professor can be happy with the thought that college curricula may ultimately be made on the basis of political deals among legislators susceptible to the influence of varying groups of professors.

THE APPROVED PROGRAM APPROACH

I think, then, that most of us are agreed that the "prescribed exposure" approach to teacher education leaves much to be desired. The logic of the arguments against it would lead, it seems to me, to the proposition that the designation of specific courses to be required should be a function of a particular college faculty, which knows in greater detail what the proposed courses are actually like and which is in a position to design a pattern of required courses that adds up to a coherent and effective program. I assume that many of you refuse to follow this logic to its conclusion because you are convinced that certain colleges lack the ability or the integrity to exercise this responsibility seriously and well. Therefore, you have turned to the "approved program" approach to which I, too, now turn. *Theoretically,* and I have underlined this word in my manuscript, this approach involves the "state" examining the program prescribed within the state by each institution which trains teachers, and deciding whether the courses offered are the right courses, whether they are well given, and whether adequate standards of passing and failing are maintained.

Theoretically the "state" in examining an institution would be quite prepared to listen to arguments as to why in the institution's opinion the future chemistry teacher, for example, should be required to pass a course in calculus, or why a secondary school teacher should be required to pass a course in the history of education. Or, conversely, why the institution had decided both requirements had proved unnecessary and were going to be dropped. (Let me say I am quite aware that I am once again indulging in the fallacy of misplaced concreteness, but I assure you I shall have enough to say later about what the word "institution" is supposed to convey.)

Speaking again "theoretically," a state might approve one institution in which the general education program included a great many courses in science and another in which the science offering was tightly compressed; it might approve one institution which required a great many courses in education and a second which required few. However, in practice, reality forces those who administer an approved program approach to fall back on something which closely resembles the prescribed exposure approach.

I shall try to speak very carefully at this point for I know that I now begin to criticize a movement in which many of you have worked very hard. In developing these programs you have hoped to insure greater flexibility in teacher education, and greater responsiveness to the opinions of all concerned in the design of guidelines for state-approved programs. I share these hopes. And though I shall argue that the techniques developed do not achieve the end desired, the efforts to develop state-approved programs have provided a basis for the next steps which I shall recommend. In several states the professors of education and the professors of other subjects have achieved greater mutual understanding as the result of working together on guidelines for approved programs. In a number of states, college and state department people have acquired greater ease and effectiveness in working together, and an increased number of local school administrators and teachers have been involved in discussions of teacher education. Indeed, in some states the kind of three-way partnership of state officials, college faculties, and public school systems needed to set up more effective teacher certification arrangements is close to realization.

The present type of approved program approach is not the answer to our problem, however. These programs in large measure continue to utilize guidelines which allocate, sometimes within broad limits, to be sure, the amount of a potential teacher's exposure to courses in general education, subject matter specialization, and professional instruction. But, though guidelines may be stated in general terms, their application must, in the nature of the case, be specific. Those who approve must decide that a college requires either too much or too little general education; that particular courses in general education or professional education achieve the purposes for which they were designed or they do not; that quality instruction is provided or it is not. Such decisions ultimately come down to precise, though unstated, criteria no matter how general may be the stated guideline under which they are subsumed. Moreover, for anyone to determine quality of instruction, or the coherence and adequacy of a total program as it is actually taught (as opposed to its catalog description), requires expertness in the subjects being considered and a great deal of time spent on the campus and in the classrooms under evaluation. No state department can afford a staff of experts sufficient to appraise whole programs in teacher education, and neither their own people nor visiting experts employed for a particular evaluation can spend enough time on a campus to make adequate judgments. They are therefore forced to fall back on formulas which approximate exposure formulas. These already formidable problems would be magnified many times if the approving agency sought to examine the individuals proposed for certification to determine their degree of mastery of the material to which they had been exposed. For this most crucial judgment the approving agency is compelled therefore to fall back on the integrity and the effectiveness of the institution being evaluated.

There is an interesting bit of irony here: while a hurried and inadequately staffed team attempts, by looking at course descriptions and organizational charts, to determine whether or not a given faculty can be trusted to prepare teachers, it is forced to accept the judgment of the faculty in question on the most important judgments involved in certification, namely, "Does a specific teacher-candidate know what he needs to know, and can he effectively practice what he needs to practice?"

LIMITATIONS OF NATIONAL ACCREDITATION

Partly for these reasons—partly because of the problem of reciprocity to which I will return later—and partly because this organization and its predecessor had sought for years to build machinery for institutional self-study and for interinstitutional consultation on teacher education problems, there has arisen within the last decade a national movement to relieve the state of the task of approving programs in teacher education. There is no need for me to describe even briefly this movement to this audience. However, for any outsider who may wonder what is meant by those mystic letters NCATE, I shall have to say a few words about the operation of this body—the National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education.

The operation could not be understood, of course, by anyone who did not understand our whole system of so-called voluntary regional accrediting organizations. For the national voluntary agency for accrediting teacher education has had to rely on the accreditation of the regional association to answer such difficult questions as: Are the courses in such fields as mathematics and English so given that if a student passes it may be assumed that he has advanced to a certain level of understanding? Are the institution's library and laboratory facilities adequate? Are the advanced courses in the fields which a high school teacher is prepared to teach courses which are really advanced courses, or are they grossly mislabeled as they are in some liberal arts colleges? A voluntary accrediting agency for teacher education is thus almost inevitably bound to be an agency for determining whether the exposure to courses given by professors of education is adequate, whether the organizational scheme of the college permits effective planning for teacher education, whether there exist arrangements for student selectivity and related matters.

In theory, one can imagine an accrediting agency which would be in a position to determine whether the total program prescribed by an institution was adequate. But for staff visiting teams to make any such survey would be an almost impossible task. So, wisely, I think, NCATE has in the past been concerned primarily with the administrative organization of the teacher education institutions, and with the nature of instruction given by the professors of education. Granted the premises of the organization, the visiting team ought to be able to report at least as well as teams of the regional accrediting associations which accredit the institutions as a whole. However, either kind of association is subject to the same kinds of limitations faced by a state department of education. Indeed they are worse off than some state departments because they have fewer full-time trained members of evaluating staffs, and are likely to know less of local conditions and of the distinctive strengths and weaknesses of particular colleges. The question we face, however, is whether or not the state should rely on such accreditation in determining whom the local boards may employ.

Let me try to be as frank as I can without being impolite, for I am well aware that most of you have strong feelings about NCATE. Some of you, I realize, are determined to protect it and to seek an expansion of its power; others are convinced as I am that its accrediting functions should be renounced. To put it bluntly, I would recommend to any faculty group or college president who asked me that the institution in question refuse to receive an NCATE visiting team. As NCATE is presently constituted the issue is quite clear. If the state's decision as to what programs are to be approved is to be determined by the judgment of a national commission, clearly dominated by a *single* interest group and relying largely on the reports of an outside team assembled for a two- or three-day visit, then NCATE is the answer. In this case the state board has said, in effect: "When a commission chosen largely by organizations affiliated with the National Education Association tells us that it has read a description of a teacher education program, that it has been advised by a team made up largely of professors of education who visited the campus for two days, and that it has concluded that teachers prepared on that campus can safely be hired by the public schools of this state, we are content with its judgment."

Personally, I am not content with such a judgment. Indeed, I do not believe that the representatives of *any single* discipline should have such power in determining who should be certified. While it is true that the "professional educators" are particularly suspect in some quarters, so far as I am concerned, I should be unhappy if *any* special interest group persuaded the state board that it should automatically certify as a high school teacher any graduate of an institution accredited by them through a process such as that used by NCATE. If one really believes that "teacher education is a whole university function," he must, I think, conclude that *all* the relevant university departments should be represented when certification decisions are made.

But the problem is not simply that of who controls NCATE. Even if it were reorganized, it could not by the accreditation process insure that the individuals prepared on a particular campus were qualified. I remind you of the difficulties I cited in respect to state approval of programs; I need not repeat them, though all are relevant in considering the potentialities of a reorganized NCATE. But in the case of a national organization there are additional problems.

Consider this problem, for example. If NCATE accreditation is used as a basis for certification, it can be so only by action of the state educational authorities. But these same authorities are also responsible for public teacher education agencies in their own state. It would be embarrassing, to say the least, if NCATE were to report to a particular state board, "We do not believe that the institutions your state maintains can adequately prepare teachers. If you have confidence in our judgment, as attested by your willingness to use NCATE accreditation as a basis for certification, you will not permit your local school boards to hire the graduates of your public colleges." A far more likely outcome, so long as the tie between accreditation and certification is maintained, would be for NCATE to avoid refusing accreditation to any state institution. The dilemma of offending state authorities at the price of losing influence in the certification process, or of giving full accreditation to what are known to be poor institutions, can, of course, be skirted by using such arrangements as temporary and provisional accreditation.

I don't know why certain NCATE decisions have been made. But I do know that I would not be willing to certify many of the graduates of certain institutions which have received some form of NCATE accreditation. I would like some day to take a group of state legislators and lay board members from states which have accepted the NCATE approach to certification on a guided tour of some of the NCATE institutions my staff and I have seen. I would like to ask them, "Are you willing to accept all graduates of this institution as potential teachers of your own children?"

Actually, as you know, most of the states which have made nominal use of NCATE accreditation as a basis of reciprocity in certification have done so only within limits, usually granting only temporary certification and often making an examination of the individual's college record before certifying. I take such actions to reflect a conviction that NCATE approval of programs does not in fact constitute sufficient grounds for certification. With this conviction I concur.

THE RESTRICTED STATE-APPROVED PROGRAM APPROACH

If NCATE is not the answer, if the prescribed exposure scheme is unacceptable, and if the state-approved program approach is so unmanageable that from a practical standpoint it becomes only a bit more flexible version of the prescribed exposure scheme, where do we turn for a policy which will permit the state to identify a pool of teachers from which local boards can safely select the people they want? I cannot provide a detailed blueprint of a teacher certification policy which will work, but I would like to suggest where to start, to provide a general plan, and to point out why I think it might be more promising than our present systems.

To begin with, it is quite clear that the only group which can maintain effective control of what actually occurs in college or university classrooms is the college or university faculty itself. There is no escaping our dependence on it. But it is equally clear that the responsibility for certifying teachers rests with the state and this responsibility neither can, nor should, be taken lightly. Finally, the "payoff" in any teacher education program is in the classroom of local school districts. Here will lie the ultimate test of the program, and here, too, must occur a significant element of the program itself: the clinical experience. So we are led to a program which involves the participation of the college and the public school system under the supervision of the state: a state-approved program. But we have already seen that if the state attempts to regulate the entire teacher education program it runs into an impossible task. What we clearly need is a more *restricted state-approved program approach.*

THE PLACE OF PRACTICE TEACHING

If the state is going to restrict its scrutiny to a portion of the program, what should that portion be? Ideally it should be one which all the groups concerned with teacher education are willing to see required by the states, and one by which the effectiveness of other components of a teacher's education can be appraised. It seems to me that we should so arrange practice teaching situations that they will meet these conditions. Therefore, I propose that for certification purposes the states focus their attention on this aspect of teacher education. To be sure, practice teaching is not the only important part of teacher education, so I also recommend that the state should demand of the college president a statement that a particular candidate has completed what his entire faculty—*academic and professional*—considers a well designed teacher preparation program. But I have encountered no responsible group denying that practice teaching is an important part of a good program, though there is a great deal of difference of opinion about every other component. Moreover, though no one could tell by a student's achievement in a chemistry course whether he could work well with adolescents in a secondary school classroom, anyone who watched him teach a high school class in chemistry might well discover inadequacies either in his knowledge of chemistry or in his ability to teach it to adolescents. Of all the components of teacher education, then, the situation in which the candidate for certification actually teaches—the practice teaching situation—provides the best chance to assess his mastery of the knowledge and skill required of an effective teacher. For this reason the course in practice teaching, and the closely related course in methods of teaching that subject—a course which loses much of its value if not tied closely to practice teaching—are all that I believe the state need require. The state should insist that the colleges and the public school systems responsible for practice teaching provide conditions under which a careful appraisal is possible. This means that the practice teaching situations must be well conducted and well supervised by the kind of public school and collegiate personnel who are capable of judging a potential teacher's *total* performance.

THE CLINICAL PROFESSOR

Obviously, the effectiveness of the *restricted state-approved program approach* depends largely on the quality of the university professor assigned to supervise the practice teacher and evaluate his work, as well as on the access which this professor has to the university departments—academic and professional—in which the student has studied prior to practice teaching. It also depends, of course, on the public school situation in which the practice teaching is being done and on the quality of the public school cooperating teacher. Let me talk for a moment about the college professor; for despite frequent claims that certain colleges are already employing the kind of people I recommend and are using them in a most effective manner, I must say that neither I nor my colleagues during our visits to many institutions found the college or university persons in charge of practice teaching to be exactly what I have in mind. A rare man or woman came near to meeting the specifications, but even these few seldom worked under the conditions I would find satisfactory. Indeed, one suspects that many who might have become first-rate "clinical professors" have been lured or driven into other activities by the reward system of colleges and universities.

The nearest equivalent to what I have in mind is the "clinical professor" in some of our better medical schools—an outstanding physician whose clinical talents bring him rewards equal to those granted his research-oriented colleagues. Let me admit right here that if the idea of appointing the equivalent of clinical professors in education is accepted, it will mean a revolution in many institutions with which I am familiar. I recognize that revolutions are not popular in academic quarters; therefore, the proponents of the restricted state-approved program approach can hardly expect to have their view welcomed with enthusiasm by most college or university administrators or most professors of either the liberal arts or education faculties. Indeed, the state may have to exert considerable pressure on teacher education institutions before this particular reform is consummated.

To understand what I mean when I say the right kind of professor who is to play so important a role in so important a segment of teacher education, let me remind you of what can be found today all too often. Practice teaching is often under the supervision, as far as the teacher education institution is concerned, of a person who has not himself or herself been active as a teacher for years. In the case of secondary school teachers, the person may never have taught the subject in question and never have been prepared to teach it! I make these statements on the basis of a considerable amount of evidence obtained by both visiting institutions and talking to teachers. For example, I remember discussing the controversial question of the best method of teaching reading with a group of young elementary school teachers. I said: "In the college or university you attended you received some instruction in methods of teaching reading" (to which there was not a unanimous reply); and went on to say, "In your practice teaching you had instructions from a professor who was experienced in teaching reading." "Quite the contrary," was the almost unanimous reply. "The member of the faculty who was responsible for practice teaching hadn't taught an elementary class for years" (some said "never!").

I have related an experience which was by no means unusual. I have rarely visited an institution in which an experienced teacher of a secondary school subject—say mathematics or English—was responsible for the practice teaching unless that person had given up teaching and had no intention of returning. Usually he or she was an ex-teacher engaged in "more scientific matters" —doing research and publishing papers. As I have been told so often, no one can become a full professor unless he has published. In short, even within a faculty or school of education, being an outstanding elementary or secondary school teacher and continuing to be such a teacher are not sufficient grounds for being appointed a professor. I humbly suggest this tradition is completely wrong. I have argued as a university president as hard as anyone, and much longer than most, for the combination of research and teaching, and in a graduate faculty of arts and sciences I would still so argue. But I know from my experience that a clinical professor of surgery, for example, is a highly important person in a medical faculty and a hospital. I know the evidence required for a surgeon to be appointed to such a post and it is not on the basis of his research. Probably he has done no research. The basis for the appointment is his outstanding accomplishment as a surgeon and it is assumed he will continue to practice surgery. To pick another example, I know that if I had demanded of the dean of the Harvard School of Architecture that the new full professor who was to be appointed had to show a list of publications, we would never have called Walter Gropius from London—one of the acts of my administration of which I am most proud. I also know if Professor Gropius had not continued to practice as an architect he would not have succeeded in starting a revolution in the schools of architecture in the United States by introducing what were then called "ultra-modern" ideas.

You may say I have wandered far from my

subject, the restricted state-approved program approach to the certification of teachers. But I assure you this question of the kind of person who carries the responsibility of the college or university in practice teaching is basic. I may also add that in my experience, practice teaching will continue to fall far short of its potentialities until the successful school teachers are given the highest status in the faculty and held responsible for the organization and carrying out of practice teaching.

I should hope the person or persons responsible for practice teaching in the elementary schools would carry some such title as "Professor of the Theory and Practice of Elementary Teaching." The corresponding person for secondary education would carry a title such as "Professor of the Teaching of Mathematics," or "Professor of the Teaching of English," or "Professor of the Teaching of Chemistry and Physics," or "Professor of the Teaching of Biology." These titles are worth a moment's consideration because behind them lurks a serious problem for the small institution. Can a small liberal arts college recruit such an array of professors? Of course, such persons will be giving only part of their time to the supervision of practice teaching and only receiving a portion of their salary from the teacher training institutions. But the president of a small college may have difficulty, first of all, reconciling his faculty to giving a high school teacher the rank of full professor and, second, finding the necessary people. This difficulty will be closely related, however, to the difficulty of the same college in providing adequate practice teaching facilities. Yet I must say that quite apart from the merits or demerits of the proposed new method of teacher certification, I am convinced that a college had better stop trying to prepare our secondary school teachers in any given field if adequate practice teaching in that field is not available and if an experienced teacher in that field cannot be found to supervise the teaching as a professor of the college. It is unpleasant for me to recall the institutions I have visited where a few harassed individuals, carrying the title of professor of education, were trying to give all the courses in education and supervise all the practice teaching in English, mathematics, physics, chemistry, biology, and social studies. Yet more than one such institution has been accredited by NCATE. I may as well state my conviction in the bluntest terms. A college has no business pretending to educate a future secondary school teacher if properly supervised practice teaching cannot be arranged. By properly supervised, I mean supervised by a professor of the institution who has been, and still is, a teacher of the subject which the student teacher is learning how to teach. To use my shorthand terminology, a college must be staffed with as many clinical professors as there are fields in which the institution is prepared to declare that the graduate is prepared to teach. To my mind, majors and minors should disappear, but that is parenthetical.

I am sorry to have taken so much time criticizing the present situation in practice teaching and explaining the importance I attach to appointing the right kind of person to supervise the work and giving him or her a position of top prestige. However, the matter is of such vital importance, whatever the basis of certification, that I would be justified in devoting the whole lecture to some such topic as the clinical professor, his duties and obligations. As it is, I must attempt only to outline the way the clinical professor would carry out his work emphasizing that *the kind of person and the position he holds in the institution* are the essential elements.

The clinical professor must, then, be an outstanding teacher of the subject and grade level for which he is preparing teachers; but if he is to appraise the candidate's mastery of subject matter, his ability to apply insights from psychology and the other social science disciplines, and his awareness of relations between the school and other social forces, the clinical professor will require more than simply the art of teaching. To guide and appraise his practice teachers, he must obviously have a more thorough understanding of his field and of such educational disciplines as psychology than would be required if he taught *only* at the elementary or secondary school level. Therefore, it seems likely that the best clinical professor will be found among those experienced teachers who have returned to the universities for advanced study closely related to public school teaching assignments.

DUTIES OF THE CLINICAL PROFESSOR

What are the duties of the clinical professor? First of all, he must see that the practice teachers are assigned to highly competent public school cooperating teachers who are anxious to play the role of master teachers and sympathetic guides to the student apprentice, and whose administrators support them in this desire. Second, he must visit the schools in which his practice teachers are working often enough, and over a long enough period, to work effectively with both the cooperating teacher and the practice teacher. On the basis of these visits and of his own knowledge and experience he should provide instruction in the special methods and materials for teaching that subject at that grade level. Systematically he and the cooperating teacher must assess the strengths and weaknesses of the practice teacher, since ultimately the two of them must recommend certification or noncertification by the state. This assessment should include judgments of the candidate's mastery of his subject and of his ability to work effectively with children of the age he proposes to teach, as well as of his technical skill as a teacher. Indeed, whatever knowledge or personal characteristics the university expects in the teachers it produces should be checked on at this point by the clinical professor.

Consider what might happen, indeed what should happen, if at the end of the practice teaching situation the cooperating teacher and the clinical professor found themselves unable to recommend to the state department of education that a particular person be certified because he lacked adequate control of his subject. What ought to happen, but very rarely does occur today, is the following: the clinical professor takes the matter up with the subject matter department and says, in effect: "What is going on here? You recommended to the president through our regular channels that Mr. X was adequately prepared to teach English (or chemistry or mathematics) as far as his knowledge of the subject was concerned. He passed all the courses you prescribe, but we have found his knowledge of several aspects of the field is minimal. In short, he doesn't know what he needs to know to teach the high school course."

The department head would already know the clinical professor to be an experienced and well prepared high school teacher of English (or chemistry or mathematics), a man hopefully appointed with the support of the academic department. Therefore, he could not respond, as he might now legitimately respond in too many of our better universities: "What claim have you as a professor of education to criticize the adequacy of instruction in this department?"

If the department head, for any reason, simply brushed off the criticism and refused to do anything to strengthen the program, the clinical professor would then be in a position to carry his complaints to the college or university teacher education council. He might remind all concerned that the state's approval of the university's right to recommend teachers for certification was conditioned on the assumption that weaknesses identified in the practice teaching situation would be eliminated. Presumably the state department and the public school system involved in the practice teaching arrangement would be alert to evidence that the college or university was, or was not, willing to change its program when consistent evidence of malpreparation showed up in the practice teaching. Thus, without dictating specific courses at all, the state might put pressure on the colleges to eliminate weaknesses in their teacher education program in ways *chosen by the college faculty*.

In my example I have dealt with a hypothetical failure of the academic department involved; the same process would apply to failures of the professional department. If the practice teacher fails to work effectively with children of the age group to which he is assigned, the same kind of complaint can be carried back to the departments of psychology and educational psychology; if he cannot use evaluative instruments adequately, those who give instruction in tests and measurements can be called to account; if he lacks perspective about the relation of formal education to other social forces in America, the social science professors and the professors of the history or the philosophy of education can be questioned.

A TOTAL INSTITUTIONAL RESPONSIBILITY

What I am suggesting is not only that the state focus its attention on practice teaching, I am also urging all departments of the university to use these arrangements as a basis for assessing the effectiveness of their teacher education programs. This is the point where an "all-university" approach to teacher education can be made meaningful. The clinical professor is the key, but he will not be the only university person involved. One would hope, in such cases as my hypothetical one about inadequate knowledge of English, that the academic departments involved would encourage their own members to examine the work done by their practice teachers and to use this examination as a basis for the revision of their courses and curriculum. Indeed, I don't see any other way for them to know how to respond to the recommendations of the clinical professor; certainly they would not want him to dictate their offerings. From the standpoint of both the state and the college or university, the critical question should always be, "How well do our graduates actually teach?"

I submit that this critical question cannot be answered by an accreditation agency such as NCATE, nor can it be answered by the "prescribed exposure" approach to certification. The kind of evaluation I have just described is, so far as the future employers of the student—the administrators and school boards—are concerned, a far better guarantee of adequate knowledge than any of the present systems. The institution which has developed the kind of responsible attitude I have outlined is the guarantee that the schoolteachers whom the board proposes to hire really are competent.

However, this guarantee is reliable only *if* the right kind of person is appointed to the clinical professorship, *if* adequate practice teaching arrangements and facilities are available, and *if* the institution has so fully and honestly accepted its responsibility for teacher education that it can and will respond when failures in practice teaching reveal weaknesses in its program. And who is to decide whether the questions implied by my *if's* are in fact answered in the affirmative? The answer is the state certifying agency—basically the state board acting through its chief state school officer. Before giving the green light to an institution applying for the right to train teachers under the restricted state-approved program, the state board, through its agents, would have to examine the alleged institution-wide commitment to teacher education and to determine whether or not there existed machinery with power to make this commitment a reality. It would then have to approve the criteria by which clinical professors were appointed and the conditions under which they were to work. Finally, it would have to determine whether or not the practice teaching facilities were adequate, which would involve, of course, arrangements with an agency of the state—the local school board. Only if the state were satisfied on these three points would the restricted state-approved program become a reality. Only if frequent checks on these three questions were made would the program continue to be effective.

Does such a *restricted* approval demand too much of state officials? Not to my mind. To be sure, some states would have to enlarge their staffs, but certainly the demands would be far less than those required for an exhaustive approval of an entire program. A far narrower range of talent is required to find answers to these three questions than would be needed by a group that sought to evaluate instruction in all aspects of a college or university teacher education program.

Is too much power placed in the hands of the state? The state basically has all the power: the public school teachers are paid by the state directly or indirectly and are appointed by boards whose power derives from the state legislature. The question, which I have often heard, usually means: Does this or that proposal place too much power in the hands of state officials? This is an important question. My answer would be: The restricted approach places in the hands of state officials the power which they can exercise competently. It reduces the interference of state officials in the actual curriculum and instructional processes of the college to a minimum, but the power to interfere in these matters rarely yields worthwhile results. Working through the clinical professor, who is employed under criteria it approves, the state exercises its power at the all-important point of practice teaching. Indirectly, since the clinical professor will teach the special methods course associated with practice teaching, it will have some influence over this course as well. It can support the clinical professor when he urges the relevant university departments to eliminate persistent weaknesses of teachers being prepared, but the precise nature of reforms will lie totally in the hands of the departments and of the university or college, or in its teacher education committees.

What groups might be most fearful of the consequences of the spread of the restricted state-approved program approach? It seems to me that two groups might be fearful, though for very different reasons. Those among the liberal arts professors who believe that all one requires to teach their subjects is an A.B. degree with a major in the subject would see in the new approach a fundamental challenge to their contention and a proposed interference in their business. Those among the professors of education who believe that enrollments in certain professional courses would dwindle unless protected by the state—either directly or through accreditation procedures in which they have major influence—would also be fearful of the restricted state-approved program approach. Between these two groups the lines for disagreement are clearly drawn, but I would hope that the majority of professors of both groups would want to see decisions about teacher education based on a careful appraisal by the entire college or university faculty of the effectiveness of the students they turn out. I would have them revise their teacher education programs as they discover limitations in the old practices or promises in the new. This I believe would become possible under the certification system which I have recommended.

There remain two other points to which I must refer briefly, though they are tangential to the topic of my lecture. Let me turn first to the matter of multiple certification to insure continued in-service teacher education, and then to the question of reciprocity among states. The two are not unrelated, since present reciprocity arrangements apply simply to initial certificates, and the teacher is still required in time to complete the special requirements for permanent certification in the state in which he teaches.

MULTIPLE CERTIFICATION

On the matter of multiple-level certificates, as many of you know, the permanent or highest standard certificate issued in many states is designed basically to encourage the continuation of in-service education. However, one must suspect that it is also used as a device for further checking on teachers admitted to temporary certification on the basis of reciprocity or of emergency. Moreover, it seems in some cases to provide state protection of courses which have not found a place in the original certification requirements but which some group considers desirable. In the last case, the requirements, reflecting special interests and political manipulation, are likely to vary broadly from state to state. I strongly doubt the validity of most of these requirements.

I have been discussing state certification as a process by which the state determines whether or not a person is equipped to be employed by a local school board as a beginning teacher. It seems to me that this should be done once and then the state should bow out of the picture so far as certification requirements are concerned. Whatever case may be made for them on other grounds, it is difficult to see where required courses in the methods of audiovisual instruction or in state history—to be taken *after* the person has been employed and evaluated as a teacher by a local school district—can be justified in terms of the state's certification purposes.

Certainly, a case can be made for the continuing education of teachers in service, and I have argued that for most teachers a fifth year of graduate work coming after they have gained practical experience in the classroom is highly desirable. But such work is desirable only if it is based on the particular person's teaching assignment and responds to inadequacies revealed by his particular experience. What is needed is a coherent program of education organized with respect to a specific teacher and his duties. Such continued education can be encouraged by a thorough revision of the tenure and salary schedules of local school boards, and the state authorities might well require such a revision. Effective in-service education is not composed of a grab-bag of courses required as the result of political action by special-interest groups in state capitals. If the state wishes to encourage continued education, it should not use the certification process—designed and best used for other purposes—to this end.

RECIPROCITY IN CERTIFICATION

Secondly, so far as reciprocity with respect to beginning teachers is concerned, this has in many states involved the limited use of graduation from an NCATE-accredited institution as the basis for reciprocity. In all cases where NCATE accreditation is involved, the states have made formal decisions to use this device.

Legally it would have been just as easy for them to have accomplished this end by other arrangements; for example, in several cases regional compacts were already in force before the NCATE system was available. I think in all candor that we must admit the widespread journey down the NCATE road has been the result of the decision of certain national organizations, particularly the TEPS commission, to rely on this particular tactic. For their purposes they might just as reasonably have chosen other methods. Indeed, in the public interest I believe they should have done so; for as I have already pointed out, anyone who has visited a great many NCATE-accredited institutions must know that though some of them are excellent, others are of such quality that a state department must be either uninformed or irresponsible to recommend the automatic certification of all their graduates. Thus reciprocity has been achieved in some cases at the expense of reasonable protection from inadequately prepared teachers.

Even from the point of view of those who believe that members of the teaching profession should have some control over its new entrants there are better devices than reliance on NCATE. The restricted approved program approach I have recommended is one such device. I grant that under it one could not hope immediately for nationwide reciprocity; however, one *could* hope that as soon as particular states put their teacher education houses in order, other states would grant reciprocity to their graduates. Only state-by-state reciprocity seems advisable at this time, though one hopes that reforms in those states which currently lag will not be too long in coming. It is an irresponsible profession which demands *immediate* reciprocity at a time when it knows the teacher education and certification practices in some places to be clearly inadequate.

We are told that those currently employed as professional public school teachers should control entry into "the profession." What better control can be found than an arrangement by which the cooperating public school teachers who direct practice teachers share with the clinical professor from the college the decision of whether or not to recommend a particular practice teacher for state certification?

I would strongly urge the professional associations to concentrate their attention on the support of practice teaching situations in which their representatives, the public school teachers who serve as cooperating teachers, and the public school administrators in whose school districts practice teaching is done are given an opportunity to block the certification of clearly incompetent teachers.

Under my proposal, as under most present arrangements for teacher education, no person could enter the public school teaching force without passing under the extended observation of a master teacher. If the "organized profession" wants responsibility for preventing the admission of incompetent teachers, all it need do is have its own members act responsibly as cooperating teachers. When they do so in a given state, the professional organizations can legitimately exert political force to have other states grant reciprocity. Under these conditions reciprocity might come more slowly than along the NCATE road, but it will certainly come with greater justification and with greater credit to the profession.

❦

PERSPECTIVE ON ACTION IN TEACHER EDUCATION

FLORENCE B. STRATEMEYER

THE SIXTH CHARLES W. HUNT LECTURE

Presented at the Seventeenth Annual Meeting of
the American Association of Colleges
for Teacher Education
Chicago, Illinois
February 10, 1965

Florence B. Stratemeyer, a native daughter of Michigan, was born on February 17, 1900. After forty-one years of teaching at Teachers College, Columbia, Dr. Stratemeyer assumed her present position as distinguished professor of education at Eastern Kentucky University. One of the nation's leading authorities in curriculum for teacher education, she received her B.S., A.M., and Ph.D. degrees from Columbia University. Her influence has reached many of today's teacher education faculty members and administrators who carried out graduate study under her professorship. She has been a leader in professional teacher education, having been active in the work of the Association for Student Teaching, the Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development, and the AACTE.

Among Dr. Stratemeyer's outstanding professional contributions are her chapters on curriculum and teaching in teacher education institutions which she authored for *Teacher Education for a Free People.* This book, edited by Donald P. Cottrell, dean of the College of Education at Ohio State University, was published by the American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education in 1956. Dr. Stratemeyer is also co-author of *Developing a Curriculum for Modern Living,* with Hamden L. Forkner, Margaret McKim, and Harry Passow; and of *Working with Student Teachers,* with Margaret Lindsey. She served as chairman of the Committee on Preservice Teacher Education and Professional Standards special project reported in *New Horizons for Teacher Education,* published by the National Commission on Teacher Education and Professional Standards.

Dr. Stratemeyer served as a teacher and assistant principal in the Detroit, Michigan schools, and as instructor and supervisor of student teachers at Detroit Teachers College in the early twenties. She was co-director of the Bureau of Curriculum and Research at Teachers College, Columbia University, 1924-1929.

Dr. Stratemeyer is a laureate member of Kappa Delta Pi, and served as first vice-president of that organization. She is a member of the Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development, the Association for Higher Education of the National Education Association, the American Educational Research Association, and an honorary member of the Association for Student Teaching.

PERSPECTIVE ON ACTION IN TEACHER EDUCATION

BY FLORENCE B. STRATEMEYER

THE SIXTH CHARLES W. HUNT LECTURE

Within the memory of some attending this meeting, and within the knowledge of all, teacher education has been brought into the mainstream of higher education in America. Today this field, as never before, is the object of national attention. Educators and laymen alike have set forth proposals. Some recommend breaking with present practices and developing fundamentally different programs of action; others prescribe with great assurance programs that might have been forward-looking a quarter of a century ago. But neither the successes of the past nor proposals for the future of teacher education deserve uncritical allegiance in contemporary discussions of action to be taken. Professional educators must exercise leadership in making the needed critical analysis. Unless and until all of us look at action proposals *in perspective*, we may find that they in fact undermine rather than preserve the very values they were designed to realize. Unless and until we note the interrelationships among the various elements in an action proposal, and recognize the importance of each, little will be done to provide the needed forward thrust in teacher education.

At this time I invite your attention to three areas:

the essentials of teaching-scholarship, the quality of direct experience, and the interrelationships of college teaching and research. I see these as central areas of decision making which must be viewed in perspective: first, if needed change is to follow rational uses of the intellect rather than lines of power only; second, if action taken is to make a difference in the personal and professional behavior of the college student as student and as teacher; third, if the focus of our work in teacher education is to move from the adjustment of externals—credit hours, length of program, certifying agency, administrative contingencies—to the truly central concerns of education. Few would deny that the central purpose of education is to help individuals and groups to intellectualize their experiences and to subject participation in the culture to analysis and inquiry. Central to teacher education are the understandings and skills, the spirit and driving force needed by the teacher in his own role and in guiding others to deal directly with the social, political, and moral questions of a rapidly changing social order. John Gardner, in his challenging book titled *Self-Renewal: The Individual and the Innovative Society*, states the case admirably.

> But there is not only something in organization that tends toward massiveness, elaborateness, solidity and entrenched power, there is something that glorifies forms and formalities, the superficial and external. Consider education. We think we believe in it passionately. Yet we accept all kinds of shoddy education that is no more than going through the motions. We pretend that so many courses, so many credits, so many hours in a classroom, so many books read add up to an education. The same is true of research on which we now spend billions of dollars annually. We seem immensely satisfied with the

> outer husk of the enterprise—the number of dollars spent, the size of laboratories, the number of people involved, the fine projects outlined, the number of publications. Why do we grasp so desperately at externals? Partly because we are more superficial than we would like to admit. Partly because we are too lazy or too preoccupied to go to the heart of the problem. But also because it is easier to organize the external aspects of things. The mercurial spirit of great teaching and great scholarship cannot be organized, rationalized, delegated, or processed. The formalities and externals can.[1]

I would add one other reason to the list given by Dr. Gardner, namely, lack of adequate data basic to many decisions that must or should be made. As you well know, teaching suffers more than many other fields from the difficulty of determining the relationship between preparation and behavior, between teaching and resultant learning. However, while we seek more objective and dependable evidence, we cannot delay action.

PERSPECTIVE ON TEACHING-SCHOLARSHIP

Turning to the first area, a conception of the essential nature of teaching-scholarship is central to all work in teacher education. It applies to the responsibility given to the teacher for the precious ingredient of scholarship in our society, both in his role as teacher of children and youth and in his role as individual and citizen taking intelligent action on personal, social, and political questions and situations.

What must characterize teaching-scholarship? What do the generally accepted qualities of scholarship really mean if the contributions of a discipline are to be seen in relation to the world of affairs? In a world of unforeseen challenges which demand knowledge not yet known, scholarship is a kind and quality of intellectual effort. It is effort characterized by a genuine interest in learning, by ability to set goals and pursue inquiry with rigor, and by competence to apply the method of intelligence to developing problems and changing situations.

---

[1] Gardner, John. *Self-Renewal: The Individual and the Innovative Society.* New York: Harper & Row, 1963. pp. 81-82.

KNOWLEDGE AS AN INSTRUMENT OF POWER

A first dimension of such scholarship is *understanding the power of knowledge to open doors.* Experiencing knowledge as a means for exploring reality, and for envisioning new realities, places emphasis on the *use* of knowledge, on the ability to do something with that which the individual knows. It means using knowledge for self-discovery, and for becoming all that one can become, and to develop personal values, as well as to use knowledge for the pragmatic and socially functional. Whitehead was dealing with this point when he defined education as "the art of the utilization of knowledge." Clearly, the internalization of knowledge for its own sake, and the acceptance of knowledge as a body of knowns to be assimilated and used only in its present forms, is a *misuse* of knowledge. When knowledge is thus misused, the desire to go on learning is satiated, not increased; the unknown is avoided rather than explored, and the known becomes the dominating guide to action, eliminating the urge to question or to doubt, and to find new realities. Rather than viewing rapidly expanding knowledge as providing increased power to interpret and respond to the changing dimensions of his world, to explore new and different ways of behaving, the student perceives expanding knowledge as an insurmountable hurdle, as something overwhelming and anxiety-producing, something from which to escape.

Have our actions, in our quest for quality and emphasis on excellence, facilitated or hindered our students in experiencing the power of knowledge to free rather than to enslave? Two characteristics seem to have been dominant in the action taken by many colleges and by individual teachers. One general response has been the addition of course requirements to provide more exhaustive study of the academic disciplines, especially as they relate to the students' major teaching fields. Emphasis within courses has been on a greater accumulation of positive information, extension of required reading, sharing of the teacher's knowledge through more carefully prepared lectures addressed to large groups of students, and more examinations to test knowledge retention. All too frequently such actions decrease a student's opportunity for exploration and his interest in reflection. The second characteristic would seem to be more promising of the quality of scholarship desired. I refer to emphasis on the method of inquiry used by scholars in a discipline, the attention given to discovery learning, and the stress on basic concepts and principles of each discipline. For the most part, however, the focus seemingly has been on how to help students attain concepts already known to scholars, arriving at these concepts through study of data presented by the teacher. Borrowing a phrase from Gardner's aforementioned book, "We are giving our young people cut flowers when we should be teaching them how to grow their own plants."[2]

Using the power of knowledge to open doors involves a second dimension of scholarship, namely, *having insight into significant relationships* among ideas, phenomena, and events. When the focus is on using knowledge to explore reality and envision new realities of life, it is questionable whether learning to use the methods of the scholar and the basic concepts of *separate* disciplines is adequate. Specialized viewpoints, unless brought into relationship, may well lead to a fragmented view of life. In the world of human affairs, problems and situations do not fall into discrete compartments labeled "political," "economic," "historical," "aesthetic," "technological." Human affairs call for decisions to be made and require that we draw upon all that we know. Moral issues are a part of politics and technology; the world of beauty is integral to many aspects of science. Although speaking of the education of children, my colleague Dwayne Huebner points clearly to the interlocking relationships among disciplines as individuals approach their world.

> To see the sunset only as the visual artist sees it is to know of color and hue and form and feeling.
> To see it only as the scientist sees it is to know of refraction and reflection and light. The sunset is all of these and more. For the child to respond to the sunset rather than simply to color or light, he must perceive it through the eyes of the artist and scientist and poet and others.[3]

There is evident need for scholarship that envisages the significant relationships *among* the disciplines as found in the structure of the world and in life itself, as well as the relationships *within* a discipline.

---

[2] *Ibid.*, p. 21.

[3] Huebner, Dwayne. "Knowledge: An Instrument of Man." (Unpublished)

The need is clear. The question is: how best provide for both systematic study of a field of knowledge and for developing ability to deal with issues and problems that are broader than those of any one field. Without some understanding of the various disciplines, the individual has no way of knowing their relevance to the problems and situations confronted in human affairs. Without some understanding of the organized fields of knowledge, it is difficult to know and ask the kinds of questions that the various disciplines can help to answer. Without opportunity to deal with problems and issues that are broader than those of any one field, it is difficult to understand the interrelationships among the fields and to make full use of the modes of thought and subject matter of the various disciplines.

Efforts to deal with this question have been varied—interdisciplinary collaboration, study of "great books," block courses, seminars of various kinds. There is obvious need for much more study and experimentation. However, rather than continue certain movements toward increased specialization it might be well to explore new emphases on the basic integrations of life. Building on insights gained in the changing secondary school, one such emphasis might be experimental testing of a problem-raising, coordinating seminar to parallel work in the separate disciplines. The seminar would be the unifying agent in clarifying relationships among the various disciplines through its focus on problems and situations that have their roots in the structure of human affairs.

Scholarship that uses the power of knowledge to open doors and provides insight into relationships has a third characteristic of special significance today. This characteristic concerns *differentiating between intensive and extensive study, between awareness as contrasted with understanding-in-depth of situations of human importance.* The present rate of change, the growing complexity of every man's life and the increasing scope of his concerns in "one world," the range of developments about which each individual must be knowledgeable to act intelligently—these and other factors point to the need for scholarship that consciously recognizes the inevitable gap between awareness of developing situations and full understanding of these situations. Some may wish to reserve the term *scholarship* for study of areas and problems in depth. And this can be done in fields of specialization. But even in this instance, the scholar must determine what is meaningful and significant, and differentiate between the areas that must be studied in depth and those which safely may be dealt with less intensively.

For some time there has been developing, in our world of increasing specialization, the need to use the method of intelligence in making decisions relating to the activities of specialists—to one's physician, to political leaders, to a range of specialists seeking to influence thinking through mass media. It is a part of teaching-scholarship to know how to help individuals to live in a world of enormous complexity, and to be sensitive and potent in the world even in areas where they have only limited understanding. It means teaching in such a manner as to help individuals to differentiate between needed study-in-depth and more general exploration of an area, to know the role of the expert and how to use his services intelligently, to help the expert share his findings in ways understandable and useful to those who need to be aware of them but have only limited understanding. Each individual in our society must be able to relate to others who have more complete understanding and, in turn, to share appropriately his competence in areas which he has studied in depth.

I know of little that has been done consciously to develop this aspect of teaching-scholarship. Without doubt individual counselors have had the general domain in mind as they advised students in the selection of courses and other activities. However, the point-system of grading, the criteria employed in awarding honors, the bases for admission to the upper division of a college or to graduate study have interfered with the achievement of this quality of scholarship. No longer should our actions belie the goal of achieving power to distinguish between areas in which awareness and limited understanding are adequate and areas in which no stone must be left unturned to develop understanding-in-depth. Our actions should never lead to lowering of standards. With present movements providing for individualized program planning and for independent study, perhaps the time is at hand to place new emphasis on the central role of educational guidance, on setting goals in behavioral terms and replacing grades by cumulative recording (by the student and those who work with him) of evidence of progress toward the goals. Even within present structures it should be possible to recognize that whatever represents an appropriate and intelligent level of competence in an area for Student X may be inappropriate for the competence needed by Student Y. Now may be the time to provide real differentiation in attendance at courses and in requirements to be met within courses—attending part-time or on an auditing basis—in terms of specific needs, interests, or problems under study.

Proposals for such action may cause you to think that I have forgotten such modern realities as the mounting college enrollment and the difficulty of securing staff members whose backgrounds of experience prepare them to work in the ways suggested. The task is not easy, but the need is imperative. It requires changes in programs at both the graduate and undergraduate levels, and changes in the preparation of college teachers as well as in the preparation of beginning teachers. Contemporary conceptions of the teaching role provide an opportune time for examining teacher education programs. To prepare teachers to guide learners in interpreting experience, in envisaging new and different ways of achieving goals sought, and in having the courage to take steps toward their realization is quite a different matter from preparing teachers whose central role is to make knowledge available to learners.

MORE THAN COGNITION

Really to know the power of knowledge and to use knowledge intelligently requires more than knowing. For most individuals scholarship has a fourth characteristic. It is a quality of intellectual effort that means zeal for constructive action based on meaningful *interrelating of thinking, feeling, and behaving.* The relations between intention and action, insight and courage, vision and drive are factors vital to scholarship today, and mandatory in teaching-scholarship.

In a society such as ours, in which man can control the rate of change in many vital areas, there is need for scholarship which includes moral and aesthetic sensitivity as well as scientific dimensions. Recent technological developments have dramatically pointed to the importance of a value system and the moral use of knowledge, and for consistency between values held and behavior. In relation to his work with electricity, Thomas Edison bespoke this need when he reportedly said, "May our God-given ingenuity be matched by our equally God-given humanity." A critical aspect of scholarship is deriving and affirming values—the values assumed, the values questioned, the values sought and the steps to be taken toward their realization. Much of the good derived from free inquiry that leads where it will depends on the spirit and motives of the inquiring individual.

To relate thinking and action meaningfully depends upon recognition that the cognitive and the affective are functionally interdependent. Investigations in the behavioral sciences show quite clearly the complementary nature of the rational and the emotional. Emotion is the driving force of life. The role of intellect is to enrich rather than curb the emotions, to direct their expression toward goals emerging from viable knowledge and cultural ideals. Only to the degree that intellectual power and emotional drive are related can thought grow so that behavior is consistent with values sought, and courage to act is in keeping with insight. All this does not minimize the importance of rational, intellectual knowledge.

Quite the contrary, such knowledge becomes vital only as it becomes a part of the whole person, as intellect and feelings interact.

The special significance of the relating of thinking, feeling, and behaving for teaching-scholarship is poignantly suggested by an experience reported at this conference last year.

> And I think often of the teacher who suddenly discovered that her children, those little Mexican-Americans, didn't like her. And as she said one day to those youngsters, "Why don't you like me?" And one boy, with temerity, said, "Because, teacher, when you touch us, you shiver inside."

Is this teacher an exception? How have our actions squared with the need for balanced development, for scholarship that recognizes the interlocking relationships of thinking, feeling, behaving? Regretfully, it would seem that all too often the focus and concentration has been on the development of the intellect, and in many instances on abstract intelligence and relatively high recall. In some instances there has been a return to emphases that characterized the traditional liberal arts with its dualism between mind and body. Further, scientific knowledge has become the paradigm for all knowledge and we have tended to value knowledge in the degree that it is definite, objective, and verifiable. The study of history, literature, and the arts is markedly affected by such a focus, as is the developing discipline of education.

What action is indicated? Let me briefly identify several areas in which I now feel action is needed. One relates to *self-awareness* and *self-*

---

[*] Loving, Alvin D. "Leadership for Survival." *New Developments, Research, and Experimentation in Professional Laboratory Experiences.* Cedar Falls, Iowa: Association for Student Teaching, Bulletin 22: 48; 1964.

understanding, including *knowledge about feelings.* From the well-known saying, "What you are speaks so loudly I cannot hear what you say," to the most recent studies, the significance of the individual personality is evident. Teaching itself is a very personal experience; using the self to help children and youth to learn means much more than what one says and the symbols used. How the teacher is viewed as a person may have more to do with what is learned than all the ideas exchanged—his compassion, his humility, his evident respect for individuals, his faith, his dedication. Again, this in no way denegates the importance of knowledge. Rather, it calls for an extension of knowledge and understanding to areas not now adequately covered by most programs—the prospective teacher's range of sensitivity and skill in differentiating his feelings; his own awareness of himself and of the basic nature of perception, as well as his ability to identify affectively-toned assumptions and beliefs; and his self-acceptance in a positive sense. Despite the increased meaning and significance of the area and developing research in the behavioral sciences, few of us have more than limited comprehension of what is involved in developing self-understanding. We do know that more and different experiences are required. We know that growth comes "quietly within the consciousness of each individual" through the climate of the college as an institution, the personal and human responses of faculty, the nature of advisement, and the informal and organized activities of college life. In the years ahead we must provide the conscious and careful nuturing of these and other activities.

Another area of action relates to *recognizing* *dimensions of excellence in the affective domain.* Standards for admission to college and to the profession must include but should no longer be limited to the intellectual. As already noted, the integrity and wholeness of the individual cannot be bypassed. We all know that some students of less intellectual ability—as judged by the usual tests of abstract intelligence and use of verbal symbols—can meet rigorous academic standards because of a strong personal integration and drive. In the foreword to Gardner Murphy's essay, *Freeing Intelligence Through Teaching,* it is stated this way:

> We know, for example, that a person's I.Q. score may be a very imperfect predictor of his eventual productivity, for a person's image of himself and his level of self-acceptance may be at least as significant as any abstract intellectual potential.[5]

Again, action to be taken should in no way lower standards, nor should the affective and cognitive domains be thought of as two distinct and opposing areas. The action required is balancing standards of intellectual competence with standards of individuality, recognizing that equality does not mean identity, and seeking to find the channels by which a given student can best achieve the several dimensions of teaching-scholarship. To standards of verbal and abstract intelligence must be added standards in human relations, in setting goals that are both realistic and forward looking, in perception of self, in nonverbal skills, and in translating ideas and values into behavior. Perhaps the time is at hand when an organized group or a number of colleges cooperatively, with the help of specialists in evaluation, should undertake to develop instruments of assessment dealing with the cognitive and affective domains in relationship.

---

[5] Wirth, Arthur G. "Foreword" to *Freeing Intelligence Through Teaching* by Gardner Murphy. New York: Harper & Brothers, 1961. p. 8.

The next area of action relates directly to the *behaving* aspect of "thinking, feeling, behaving"—the quality of social conscience and courage that does not permit the individual to stop short of appropriate action. It is required that in our teaching we give direct attention to *tolerance for uncertainty and for intelligent risk-taking.*

Erich Fromm has stated that "Free man is by necessity insecure; thinking man by necessity uncertain."[6] Our insecurity and uncertainty are today aggravated by the complexity and the seeming and real contradictions of our world on the one hand, and on the other by habit and the constant pressure to conform amid rapid change. Insecurity must not be mistaken for escape; it must not be equated with a negative state to be avoided; it must be understood as the necessary springboard for discovery.

Among other things this means giving attention to levels of risk-taking, to bases for predicting possible outcomes of a risk, to the role of subjective knowledge and bias as contrasted with established knowledge, to the role of intuition, of beliefs, of values. It means giving attention to the essentials of question-asking, and providing for development of fortitude to change in keeping with pertinent evidence. Perhaps the most important quality of mind to be sought, when all the facts cannot be known and controlled, is the disposition to question responsibly. There should result an understanding of when to base action on limited data and when to seek further evidence, when and how to live with uncertainty and when precise and complete clarification is mandatory.

---

[6] Fromm, Erich. *The Sane Society.* New York: Rinehart, 1955. p. 196.

THE UNIQUE PROFESSIONAL DIMENSION

The four qualities of teaching-scholarship discussed thus far—using knowledge to open doors to enriched and more meaningful living, having insight into significant relationships, differentiating between the need for awareness and for study-in-depth, recognizing the interrelatedness of thinking, feeling, behaving—should characterize all scholarship. Certain differences in emphasis important to teaching-scholarship have been noted, particularly the significance of the personal and affective domain, the mandatory nature of action, and the selection of knowledge relevant to the teaching field(s). A unique fifth dimension is required of the teacher, for his scholarship must include *having insight into helping others —individuals and groups—develop competence and genuine interest in learning.* This characteristic distinguishes teaching-scholarship from that of other professionals.

So conceived, the most important responsibility of the teacher, from nursery school through postgraduate college, is to provide a climate for learning and to enhance the learning process. How easy to say, how difficult to achieve! To free the "talent" of each individual, *for* contact with the significant knowledge that opens doors and *from* the fears and chains of uncertainty and lack of value orientation, requires that rigorous scholarship be applied to the developing discipline of education as well as to the content of the teaching field(s). How different the dimensions of the scholarship needed when the central focus of teaching is no longer telling, but is the guidance of the learner in discovering realities, when learning to ask the right questions may be more important than having definitive answers, when a few basic concepts and principles vital to understanding life may be more significant than a wide range of information, when the teacher is a "quickener of the impulse-life through which thought can grow" rather than developer of cognition alone, when teaching is the reaching out by the teacher and the building of bridges to the outreached mind of the learner.

It is not the purpose of this paper to delineate the indicated areas of study that should be included in the professional sequence. Suffice to mention, without discussion, a few that are often ignored and at times denied in present consideration of professional education. I refer to including in a study of the nature of the learner and the learning process such areas as individual styles of learning, what they may be and how they can be identified; the psychology of perception, the factors that affect perception of situations and of people, and how they condition the individual's purpose; the development and modification of values and attitudes, and the struggle which individuals may have between the values and mores of their subculture and the larger culture of which they are also a part; the process of generalizing and of concept development, of raising significant questions and points of inquiry; the "personality" of a group, its culture, cohesion, and productivity, and the essentials of group interaction; and the significance of language usage and of nonverbal behaviors in human interaction.

Another area of importance in the professional sequence is consideration of knowledge and processes in curriculum development. Important dimensions in this area include understanding the rationale underlying different curriculum proposals–the perceived purposes of education and the role of the school, the goals likely to be realized, the apparent concept of the nature of the learner and the principles of learning accepted and implemented, the means of bringing about curriculum change when there are sharp differences in basic philosophy, when there is little leadership given by those in status or leadership positions, how to function effectively in carrying out one's responsibilities to learners when the curriculum is more or less rigidly prescribed, the relation between that part of the curriculum for which the individual teacher is responsible and the total educational program.

The last area to be mentioned is in some respects a cluster of closely related dimensions. It includes becoming an intelligent consumer of educational research and engaging in the practical experimentation which is a part of raising questions, setting up hypotheses, and exploring more promising ways of working; developing some understanding of the politics of education; engaging in reflective thinking about education and the school as a social institution, with growing insight into and ability to deal with criticism and with pressures on organized education.

To deal with the areas noted in this list, incomplete as it is, would hardly support present pressures to reduce or even eliminate professional requirements. Proposals for action and action currently being taken range from a telescoped version of the usual professional sequence to study in the parent disciplines of educational psychology, sociology, and philosophy and internship or on-the-job experience, to professional education offered as a part of the work in the academic disciplines(s) representing the teaching fields, to tutorials and a seminar along with student teaching. Each of these proposals shows little or no awareness of the vast body of pertinent biological, psychological, philosophical, and sociological knowledge; little awareness of the range of developing technical knowledge, principles, and theories in linguistics, aesthetics, curriculum, and evaluation that bear directly on the work of the teacher. The underlying assumptions appear to be that to know an academic field is to know how to help others to comprehend that field; that basically there are no professional problems and that the problems of teaching are those of knowing the content of the discipline; that the learner and the nature of learning can be ignored.

In responding to the current wave of proposals to modify the professional sequence drastically, the concern of the professional educator is not with change, but with the *nature* of the proposed change. It is concern with providing adequately for the unique professional dimension of teaching-scholarship, not with a possible reduction of time and credit allocation in professional education. It is not resistance to the idea of teacher education becoming an all-university responsibility. In fact, this concept is welcomed and many of us, as individuals or in connection with our work with this and other professional organizations, are already on record as advocating this idea. We are concerned, however, about the logic of the proposal that this be achieved by having professors of academic disciplines assume major responsibility for the work in professional education.

Reflecting a little further on the last point, the basic idea of looking at the professional dimensions of academic content is not new. In a report made in 1920, William C. Bagley of Teachers College, Columbia University and William S. Learned of the Carnegie Corporation recommended that the content of academic courses be treated professionally. But the motive and purpose underlying their proposal were quite different, as were the situation and personnel in the single-purpose teachers college of that time. Today, emphasis on helping the learner to understand the structure of a discipline and gain increased insight into the relationship between method and the nature of the content, and the teacher's need to sense the relevance of content for learners, make stronger the rationale for bringing academic and professional education into an appropriate relationship. Thus the professional educator does not resist having those who work in academic disciplines share in the professional education sequence, but he does question the wisdom of having this work undertaken by those who have neither an interest in nor concern for teaching-scholarship; by those who identify with their discipline and have little or no scholarship in the field of education.

Perhaps forward thrusts for teacher education might emerge if our action were to take the form of developing graduate programs to prepare college teachers with a joint major in education *and* an academic discipline, to prepare persons knowledgeable in both areas and dedicated to teaching and the preparation of teachers. Another promising possibility may lie in granting leave to persons already engaged in college teaching to study in the opposite discipline—in education or an academic field—with a view to cooperatively developing and teaching courses designed to include consideration of the relevance of content for teaching.

Serious study also needs to be made of the substantive content of professional education. There is need to identify the problems that distinguish the field of education, the dimensions in which they can be studied, and the knowledge available for the study. The work of the Teacher Education and Media (TEAM) Project of this Association is a positive illustration of one such effort. Quite properly, the teaching act is the central focus, and study of teaching is the basis for determining the professional sequence. The approach used is in keeping with the growing awareness that "teaching must be studied in its own right if it is to be understood and controlled,"[7] and recognizes that "the teacher, in the classroom, . . . must make decisions about matters that are more complicated than any of those research can handle whole."[8] Making significant use of studies of teaching, of the nature of concepts and their development, and of the structure of knowledge, the TEAM Project working paper is presented "as *a* way—one way, not *the* way—to conceptualize the purposes and content"[9] of the professional aspects of preservice teacher education.

---

[7] Smith, B. O. "Knowledge About Knowledge for Teachers." In *The Nature of Knowledge: Implications for Teacher Education*. William A. Jenkins (Ed.) Milwaukee: University of Wisconsin, 1961.

[8] Walton, John. "The Study and Practice of Teaching." *Teacher Education: A Re-Appraisal*. (Edited by Elmer R. Smith.) New York: Harper & Row, 1962. p. 155.

It is a document of high quality that merits careful study; its very worth and significance require that the suggested action be viewed in perspective. Having in mind the discussion of teaching-scholarship, the following questions are raised. In this proposal with its emphasis on the cognitive, are we failing to provide adequately for the dimension of teaching-scholarship that relates to the affective domain? While analyzing observed and recorded teacher-pupil behavior, is adequate provision made for understanding the processes and factors which account for this behavior? How do verbal responses relate to the mode of thinking of the learner and the teacher? Students in direct observation, and hopefully in the media to be developed in this project, can perceive a range of environmental conditions, movements, and sounds that affect learning other than the particular words or pattern of words. By placing emphasis on the cognitive and on early analysis of teaching models, will some students be turned away from teaching because of failure to see teaching as the real challenge that it is--to help another in the process of becoming?

A second cluster of questions relates to provision for exploration of such important responsibilities as the work of the teacher with parents, with colleagues, and as a member of professional groups. While the emphasis in the TEAM Project working paper is on preparing the neophyte to *begin* to teach, what even the beginning teacher does beyond the classroom can markedly affect what he will be able to do with pupils in school. When we omit such areas, are we saying in essence that the function of the professional sequence, other than student teaching, is to develop cognitive propositions concerning teaching? Are we saying that study of what it means to implement these propositions in curriculum development, in developing a positive learning environment, in carrying out the related dimensions of teaching, is the function of student teaching?

---

[9] American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education. *A Proposal for the Revision of the Preservice Professional Component of a Program of Teacher Education.* A Report prepared by Herbert F. LaGrone, Director, Teacher Education and Media Project. Washington, D. C.: the Association, 1964. p. iv.

Another point of inquiry, but one of a different order, refers to the responsibility that those of us who use this working paper must assume for making appropriate use of sources beyond those included. No small contribution of this work is that it makes crystal clear that there are problems that distinguish the field of education, and that knowledge is available for their study and for further exploration. But much can be learned about teaching from the writings on personality theory, from such writings as *Teacher*[10] and *To Sir, With Love,*[11] as well as from educational theorists. In addition to the very insightful analysis of "four typical uses of knowledge" by Broudy, Smith, and Burnett, is it equally important and helpful for the prospective teacher to analyze classroom activity in terms of the values and purposes for which the knowledge is being used—for example, the political and moral purposes? Sources used must be both representative of what is known about educational processes and appropriate to the motivation of the undergraduate student.

---

[10] Ashton-Warner, Sylvia. *Teacher.* New York: Simon and Schuster, 1963. 224 pp.

[11] Braithwaite, Edward R. *To Sir With Love.* Englewood Cliffs, N. J.: Prentice-Hall, 1960. 197 pp.

Still another cluster of questions relates to the proposed sequence of courses. What preparation is required for a meaningful analytical study of teaching? The problem here is the one already mentioned in the discussion of interrelationships between disciplines and problems of human affairs. In this instance, the teaching act is the human affair which draws upon various disciplines. Will the work in general or liberal education provide the necessary bases for asking the needed responsible questions as paradigms and models of teaching and protocol materials are studied? Is there need to understand learners' developmental levels in order properly *interpret* Smith's teaching cycle, for example? How to deal with the problem is no less difficult in education than it is in relation to the academic disciplines and human affairs. Perhaps there is also need in the professional sequence for a coordinating education seminar which would be task- or problem-oriented whose purpose would be to help the student clarify relationships among various aspects of the professional sequence, between the work in education and the basic disciplines upon which it draws, and between professional education and the teaching fields.

To raise such questions does not minimize the importance or value of this working paper. Let me repeat that this effort of the TEAM Project makes a substantial contribution to the unique professional dimension of teaching-scholarship. An essential quality of all scholarship is to analyze promising proposals critically, and it is this very quality of the scholarship of the persons developing the document that prompted them to invite each of us to react and respond to this draft.

PERSPECTIVE ON DIRECT EXPERIENCE

I purposely have given major time to the area of teaching-scholarship because the view held affects decisions in practically all other domains. Certainly it has a vital relationship to the nature and role of direct experience, including student teaching and the internship.

MORE THAN A PRACTITIONER; A STUDENT OF TEACHING

Little need be said to this audience in support of the teacher as a student of teaching. To conceive of the teacher as a practitioner only—as a person whose competence lies in high performance skills—is unthinkable at this period in history in terms of the dimensions of teaching-scholarship; in terms of the changing dimensions and increasingly crucial demands placed upon education; in terms of the educator's role in making far-reaching decisions. A teacher must be educated to exercise choices, to render judgments, to make decisions. Preparatory programs must provide for deep immersion in the stuff of which decisions are compounded; for familiarity with the wide range of choices which are possible; for analysis of alternatives in the light of logic, of psychological principles, of moral and intellectual standards; and for a growing personal commitment to a system of values.

To develop a teacher who is thoughtful and independent, intellectually and behaviorally—a teacher whose skilled performance is illuminated by the methods of intelligence—requires that student teaching and other direct experiences be focused sharply on the *study* of teaching, on helping the intending teacher to arrive at principles and generalizations that can be drawn from that study, and on applications of basic concepts in situations which have changing dimensions.

ACTION IN KEEPING WITH BELIEF

To what degree do current proposals relating to direct experience help the teacher-to-be to understand *what* he does, with what *results,* and *why?* Perhaps the action most difficult to square with the development of the teacher as a student of teaching is that of substituting an internship, with little or no previous direct experience, for student teaching. The novice, confronted by the myriad of immediately pressing and practical problems, perforce gives attention to the outward dimensions of teaching. His limited direct experience has not provided him with the insights needed to look through external factors and action to the significant internal dimensions. With attention fixed on the immediate, the intern adjusts his ways of behaving to what he sees succeed and fail, to what he sees other teachers do, to the directions and advice given to him. All this occurs with little reference to basic principles and theory studied at the college or to principles which might emerge from the teaching situation itself. Under these conditions, with enforced attention to professional survival, there is little opportunity to be a student of teaching.

Many colleges have never accepted the internship as a substitute for student teaching; it is viewed as providing added experience opportunities. Turning then to the student teaching experience, by our actions are we achieving the goals we seek?

Does the present emphasis on having the student work with a "master teacher" suggest only a part of what is required of the cooperating teacher? To become a student of teaching, the prospective teacher must be guided by a person of *proven ability* both to work with pupils and *to work with and induct the neophyte.* Beyond ability to demonstrate excellence in his own behavior, the truly professional teacher who works with a student teacher has ability to help that student to develop his own style of teaching, to develop the quality of thoughtful independence that characterizes the professional teacher, to understand the values and principles on which he acts as a student teacher, and to accept responsibility for clarifying and extending these guides for action. To so work with student teachers, both within and without the classroom, requires special competence. There is need to provide carefully-planned preparation for those who work with student teachers in the school setting, both to make such preparation mandatory for all teachers who have this role and to consider the inclusion of direct experience as a cooperating teacher or college supervisor as a part of that program. Rather than aggravate the present problem of securing enough adequately prepared cooperating teachers, such action might well encourage more to undertake this role and realize the attendant satisfactions for those who are prepared for the task.

Implied in the foregoing, and certainly in the prospective teacher's study of teaching, are the interlocking relationships between the college and the school. Theory and its implementation in practical settings need to grow together. For this to happen requires more, much more, than appointing a school representative to the role of clinical professor on the college staff. This is the more easily handled external. Just appointing a school representative to the college and having him work with student teachers does not provide the needed thoughtful articulation of the student's work at the college and at the school. The real gain in appointing a school representative as a clinical professor lies in a rotating plan by which an individual alternately works in the school and in the college, a plan by which he develops his own model of teaching, periodically tests it, and, at the same time, has an opportunity in his role as college supervisor to observe different models of teaching, a condition necessary to helping student teachers working in different situations. But other action is required. There is need for cooperative clarification by college and school staffs of the dimensions of teaching-scholarship and of the contributions of the various aspects of the curriculum to that scholarship.

The importance assigned to student teaching does not permit a state of euphoria. Much remains to be done to realize the power of the student teaching experience in developing persons who will continue to be students of teaching.

PERSPECTIVE ON COLLEGE TEACHING AND RESEARCH

Turning to another arena of teacher education—college teaching—there comes to mind the essay summarizing a discussion of the Trustees of the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching titled *The Flight From Teaching.*[12]

---

[12] The Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching. *The Flight from Teaching*. Summary of a discussion of the Trustees. New York: the Foundation, 1964. (Reprinted from the Annual Report—1963-64.)

What has been taking place at the college level to make this title so meaningful?

TEACHING A VALUED CENTRAL FUNCTION

Flight from teaching to what? There would doubtless be general agreement in this group that the flight is to research and publication. But why is this the case in the face of the growing recognition of the complexity of college teaching, of the changing characteristics and needs of college youth, and the developing body of substantive content bearing on teaching and learning? College teaching offers tremendous intellectual challenge and psychic rewards for the teacher who recognizes the potential power of his teaching-scholarship and the responsibility that it entails. The nature and quality of college teaching directly affect the educative or miseducative quality of the student's experience. The nature of the learning opportunity can be as potent a factor as the substantive content being studied. And for the prospective teacher, college teaching is a double-edged sword—both learning about the academic discipline or content being studied and having a direct experience with teaching. That "one teaches as he is taught rather than as he is taught to teach" holds more than a modicum of truth.

Teaching, thus, must remain a central function of all college teachers and, in a special way, of college teachers of prospective teachers. All college teachers must be teaching-scholars and identify with the teaching profession as well as with the disciplines pertinent to their teaching specialization. Recognizing teaching as of first importance is not to deny the role of research, a point which will be considered in greater detail in the section which follows. That many college teachers do not hold this view, have not experienced the satisfactions and the challenges of teaching, and do not see the reciprocal relationship between teaching and research is not difficult to understand. Many college teachers, of both the academic disciplines and of education, have included no work at all or no graduate work relating to the professional dimension of scholarship for the teacher. Others have had a course or two, and a privileged few have had opportunity to engage in college teaching under guidance, to experience high-quality guided teaching at the college level. Here would seem to be an important area of action for graduate schools, in both the academic and the professional areas.

Another factor which may affect perception of the significance of the teaching role is the growing mechanization, and the accompanying depersonalization, of the life of the college or university. Logan Wilson highlights the problem by saying:

> Many of the best values of higher education are bypassed when students are on campus merely to attend classes, and professors see them only in aggregations . . . I hope that we shall continue to hold to our faith in the improvement of human beings as an end in itself.[13]

Some things cannot and should not be mechanized; they should be accepted as they are and not made to seem less worthy. The need is especially great, and the problem most severe, in the lower division of the undergraduate college. It is good to note, in the present ferment in college education, that seminars and guided independent study periods of varying lengths are being provided for freshmen. Much more is needed and the present situation with the potential values of closed circuit television, language laboratories, and computer-handled data is an open invitation to action to keep faith in the improvement of human beings by creatively relating learner and teacher. We have hardly tapped the important role of educational guidance, of problem raising, and integrating seminars that continue throughout the college years and parallel the use of mass media in courses and independent study. This is a second area in which there is need for action that is new and different from any taken thus far.

---

[13] Wilson, Logan. "Higher Education and 1984." Address given at a meeting of the Association of Urban Universities, Pittsburgh, Pa., November 2, 1964. p. 6.

Another dimension of our situation that merits attention is the way in which undergraduate teaching is viewed. Just as the [illegible] university has become a [illegible] and colleges have [illegible] changed their names, [illegible] the teaching ladder have been from teaching [illegible] to upperclassmen in the undergraduate area, to graduate education in the teaching and increased research in the graduate area. [illegible] in research, college teachers whose primary interest is in teaching and whose goal is to become increasingly more effective in that role, and in personal interactions with students, should be appointed to teaching assignments at all levels.

More than just a change of this kind is needed. Implementing this step and taking others to eliminate the false status-hierarchy require attention to the accompanying system of rewards. Currently, the college faculty member who engages in research and publishes his work gains a reputation among his colleagues and across the nation. Teaching, on the other hand, is a very personal matter, and the able teacher may be known only to his students and through them to some of his colleagues. Seldom is his competence known beyond his own college. How to identify high-quality teaching is, of course, a critical question. That we currently know of no satisfactory objective means to judge teaching effectiveness does not remove the need nor release us from our responsibility to take steps, limited as they may be. At least there is little moral justification for basing promotion and other rewards on the more easily identified and less controversial symbols of publication and research grants.

This partial analysis of action to put teaching in its rightful place in the activities of the college teacher is well summarized in the Carnegie report already mentioned:

> In short, faculty and administration leaders should behave as though undergraduate teaching is important. They will be surprised how quickly young faculty members—and government officials—will get the message.[14]

---

[14] The Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching; *op. cit.*, p. 14.

NOT TEACHING OR RESEARCH

Search for truth is the essence of all scholarship. Research is one aspect of this all-encompassing search. In teacher education we desperately need people who are interested and able to do research. The number of areas of needed study implied and stated in this brief paper are evidence enough of this need. Not all teachers, however, need be engaged in the creation of new knowledge. Equally needed are those who are concerned with study of the creative utilization of knowledge. For this group, research is of a different order. Often this is in the nature of action research in an effort to find new and better ways of helping others to gain relevant knowledge. The contribution of many college teachers lies in integrating bodies of knowledge meaningfully. This kind of scholarship utilizes and builds upon research; it seeks the meaning of research and evaluates the significance of the findings. To deny such activities as part of the role of the scholar is to deny the already mentioned diversity of talents.

Turning now to the research in which colleges have been engaged, can we say that our action to date has done much to provide a forward thrust in teacher education? I am afraid that, taken as a whole, it has not. First, the emphasis has tended to be on *descriptive* rather than the more difficult *prescriptive* research. Emphasis on opinion research, instead of opening avenues to new ideas, has tended to give reactions to prevailing views and practices. Where efforts have been focused on implementing ideas in specific situations, a program of evaluation built in from the beginning has been woefully lacking. In some instances the sought-after funds have seemed more important than the experimentation. Improvement in this regard has been made, but the effect cannot be erased immediately.

Second, the nature of funding requirements, highly specialized grant programs, and pressures of time have frequently resulted in short-term studies rather than in the needed long-range and cooperative investigations. There is little evidence of planning research which will provide the needed cumulative data on a problem or in an area. The focus in all too many instances is upon random experimentation rather than systematic exploration and study. While many college leaders feel that the impact of grants upon the colleges and universities has been positive, renewed effort is required on our part to minimize the present limitations. To do this will require high-level statesmanship—not grantsmanship—on the part of administrative leaders. It will mean careful exploration and identification of the needed forward thrusts in teacher education; projecting new and totally different ways of preparing teachers; and helping the federal government and private agencies to understand the increased values to be derived from carefully delineated studies. The present ferment in colleges is both good and bad. Certainly much more can be achieved. In a very special way this is the role of educational administrative leadership. At all times the criterion must be the development of research to help achieve the objectives of teacher education to which the institution is dedicated. Paraphrasing the words of John Gardner—grants, as such, must never become essential to the institution's heartbeat or to the heartbeat of the individual professor.

PERSPECTIVE ON ACTION

"This time, like all times, is a very good one, if we know what to do with it." These words of Ralph Waldo Emerson underlie the central purpose of this paper. We need to look hard at what we are doing, to view in perspective the bases of our actions and whether the actions promise to achieve the goals toward which we are working. You may not agree with the areas I have selected as critical, nor with my analysis of them, nor with the questions that I have raised. My goal, however adequately or inadequately expressed, has been to seek commitment to search for the rationale underlying the action we propose to take—commitment, independently and collectively—and with our students, to bring the force of intellect to bear on what we do in teacher education in our time.

LEADERSHIP FOR INTELLECTUAL FREEDOM IN HIGHER EDUCATION

WILLARD B. SPALDING

THE SEVENTH CHARLES W. HUNT LECTURE

Presented at the Eighteenth Annual Meeting of
the American Association of Colleges
for Teacher Education
Chicago, Illinois
February 16, 1966

182/153

Willard B. Spalding, noted educator and author, is a native New Englander. Born in Massachusetts, February 9, 1904, he did his undergraduate work at Wesleyan University and Boston University. Even before receiving his bachelor's degree in 1926, he was principal of Princeton (Massachusetts) High School. In 1927 he became principal of Charleton (Massachusetts) High School and in 1930, of Hamilton (Massachusetts) High School. In 1932 he was named superintendent of Massachusetts Supervisory Union No. 18 and from 1939 to 1941 was superintendent of Belmont

(Massachusetts) Public Schools. During this time he was also continuing his education; he received his Ed.M. from the University of New Hampshire in 1933 and his Doctorate in Education from Harvard University in 1942. Dr. Spalding was superintendent of Passaic (New Jersey) Public Schools until 1944, when he accepted a similar position in Portland, Oregon.

In 1947 Dr. Spalding was named dean of the College of Education at the University of Illinois. He returned to Oregon in 1953 to become professor of education in the extension division of the State System of Higher Education. In 1956 he was made chairman of the division of education of Portland State College, where he remained until 1963 when he became associate director of the Coordinating Council for Higher Education in San Francisco. In February 1965 Dr. Spalding was named director of the Council, a position which he currently holds.

Within the field of education Dr. Spalding has served his colleagues in many ways. He was secretary of the American Council on Education from 1946 to 1947. In 1954 he was director of research on evaluation of the Arkansas Experiment in Teacher Education. A long-time member of the Oregon Education Association, he was president of that organization in 1956 and 1957. He served as official representative to the American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education from both the University of Illinois and Portland State College; from 1962 to 1964 he was a member of the AACTE Committee on Studies. Dr. Spalding has membership in Phi Delta Kappa, Kappa Delta Pi, and Phi

Kappa Phi honorary societies and the National Education Association.

Dr. Spalding has also had an outstanding career as a writer. He has contributed many articles to professional journals, including *Harvard Educational Review, American School Board Journal,* and *Nation's Schools.* In 1953 he delivered the Inglis Lecture at Harvard University entitled "The Superintendency of Public Schools—an Anxious Profession." He was consulting editor for Harcourt, Brace and Company from 1948 to 1962 and a member of the Editorial Advisory Board and book review editor of the *Journal of Teacher Education* from 1963 to 1965. In addition, Dr. Spalding has co-authored three books: *Alcohol and Human Affairs* written with J. R. Montague, *The Public Administration of American Schools* written with Van Miller, and *Schools and National Defense* written with C. W. Sanford and H. C. Hand.

LEADERSHIP FOR INTELLECTUAL FREEDOM IN HIGHER EDUCATION

BY WILLARD B. SPALDING

THE SEVENTH CHARLES W. HUNT LECTURE

The lectures to honor Charles Hunt were established in recognition of his productive leadership of cooperative efforts among colleges of teacher education to study and improve criteria by which each faculty could determine the quality of its programs of teacher education. This lecture describes characteristics of internal organizations of colleges or universities (I shall use these terms interchangeably) which encourage intellectual leadership at the frontiers of teacher education, and at every other frontier which man will cross.

The frontiers of teacher education today are where they have always been: in the hearts and minds and spirits of students. Everywhere that teachers are helping students to maintain and strengthen themselves, to acquire faith in themselves and in others, to understand themselves and the world, to that extent teachers are working at the frontier. At this ever-changing but constantly determinable boundary between the known and the unknown, teachers and teacher education face the age-old problem of how to modify the behavior of students so that each student will learn what he needs to learn, to believe, and to become.

Professional teachers must be able to teach both the knowledge and the processes of learning and of changing the world. They must also teach the downtrodden to have faith that they can rise, that society has not stacked the cards against them. They must help the downtrodden to become responsible for needed social change. And professional teachers must teach everyone not only to have faith in the ability of the downtrodden to succeed, but also to welcome them gladly and fully into every aspect and activity of society. A kick may be the quickest way to upright the lowly, but its impression is a bruise; more subtle and sympathetic ways are needed. If any of us are without faith in the lowly and are unwilling to welcome them as they rise, the cards will remain stacked against them.

Major obstacles to the development of intellectual leadership at the frontiers of teacher education, and at other frontiers, are found in the structure, organization, and administration of American colleges and universities. These same obstacles obstruct progress in the development of all new programs designed to prepare people to live, work, study, and to remain alive in the remainder of this century. My remarks will propose changes which can make colleges more appropriate instruments for educating students and for research.

I

Recently, especially in California, much has been said and written about the vast size of college and university campuses; for these campuses are indeed becoming large. Size and impersonal treatment of students are often seen as synonymous. So much so, that the Berkeley student who carried a sign reading "I am a human being, do not bend, staple, or mutilate" has become an important symbol. Yet there logically is no necessary relationship between the size of a university and the warmth of human relations within it. Rather the problem lies in the failure to recognize the need for warm human relations when developing a large organization or when continuing a small one. For if warmth is forgotten, coldness can characterize even the smallest college.

Most of the organizational factors leading to impersonal relations arise from the continued use of an archaic but traditional unit as the basic building block in the structure of the university—the department. Originally a means of bringing together a group of scholars with common interests when specialization in scholarship was less refined than at present, the department has become an agency for such activities as recruiting and employing faculty, promoting and dismissing faculty, securing research grants, recruiting graduate students, publishing scholarly journals, employing nonprofessional staff, preparing and managing budgets, scheduling classes, advising students, and assigning offices to faculty.

The department head is now much more an administrative officer than a stimulator of scholarly inquiry and teaching. His faculty expects him to secure better-than-average financial support for them and their scholarly work, a responsibility which leads him to endeavor to outwit his fellows in administrative councils. His dean and president expect him to improve his faculty by rigorous scrutiny of productivity and generous reward of productive scholars. His own values often lead him to endeavor to continue scholarly work, with consequent conflicts between its demands and those of administrative responsibilities.

In addition, the systems by which scholars organize knowledge and by which they discover and test new knowledge are now only peripherally related to the so-called academic disciplines upon which departments have been based. Further, the uses of knowledge in the practical affairs of life call for continued study of how best to use what is becoming known. Thus, the mathematics of communication theory can be important in a school of journalism, the mathematics of genetics is needed in a school of agriculture, the mathematics of automation is needed in a school of business, and so on. On the other hand, some practical problems which specialized schools are called upon to solve can provide stimulus to the development of new concepts in mathematics. The mathematical theoretician may be deprived of a source of knowledge when he is walled off in a department of mathematics. And what is true of the mathematician is also true of the historian, the psychologist, the sociologist, the chemist, and many others.

The continued separation of scholars in a department from political and public pressures deprives scholars of the rough contacts with reality which so often stimulate creativity. To a substantial degree, the rise of new institutes and centers for the study of urban affairs or higher education or desert life can be attributed in part to scholars' search for real objects to study.

Two other causes of the rise of new organizations deserve mention: first, many conventional departments no longer represent meaningful divisions of knowledge. An English department, for example, contains scholars in many fields of literature, semanticists, scholars of linguistics, possibly some old-time grammarians, teachers of various modes of writing, dramatists, poets, novelists, essayists, and so on. Some of them are more at home in an institute for the study of communication, others in a center for the study of linguistics. In short, scholars with common interests are coming together in formal organizations other than departments.

The second cause of the rise of new organizations is purely pragmatic: they are useful structures for organizing grant requests. Yet behind this pragmatism is the reality that most important areas for scholarly study do not fit departmental structure.

Further, the growth of team research indicates clearly that, even within a specialized area, a variety of understandings is needed to discover new knowledge. The lone theorist will always be with us, but his research will be increasingly overshadowed by the achievements of groups of scholars working together. A department does not usually include all varieties of understanding needed for organized research.

A new unit is required which will be much smaller than many departments can become in great multiversities. The size and internal relationships of the new unit will be determined as much by what is known and discovered about specialized human groups as by the tasks which faculty members in the unit perform. And students will also be included in the unit as participants in learning, thus reestablishing warm relationships. Units will be invented and tested wherever faculty and administration become convinced that new entities are needed. With them American colleges and universities can renew and strengthen intellectual activity of students and faculty; can increase faculty and student access to systems of relationships which are used to explain, discover, and test knowledge of the world and of men, and to change both the world and man.

II

A second major factor from which arise many of the organizational blocks to intellectual leadership is a faulty concept of the roles of administration in higher education. Too many attitudes and ideas, originally borrowed from industry and the military, are retained in the university at a time when they are being abandoned elsewhere.

Studies of human groups reveal clearly that leadership usually arises when a group needs it; that leadership is a function of group actions, not an attribute of an individual. People are not "born leaders"; rather, people learn to act as leaders in specific situations where they can be responsive to group needs. In the true sense of leadership, no college administrator can be a leader of the faculty. Yet many who try to be leaders are shaken when they fail.

A better concept of the administrator's role in respect to leadership is one in which he creates the conditions which will best encourage the growth of faculty leaders wherever specific situations require them. Leadership will shift from person to person as the situation changes from one centered on faculty salaries to one centered on research. Faculty leaders who thus arise are likely to have greater average success than do administrators now.

Creating conditions which encourage the growth of faculty leadership is an example of how administration can serve a faculty, and service to faculty and students is the primary valid justification for administration of a college. But the concept of administration as a service does not imply subservience; to the contrary, it calls for specialized functions of high quality.

Administrative service includes providing circumstances under which leaders can arise and act. It includes providing policies which lead to increased freedom in faculty and student choices of action. And it includes much more. Wherever an administrator can do something to increase the funds supporting the college, to attract superior faculty to it, to stimulate public desire for academic freedom, or to improve the accuracy of the public's perception of the college, he is performing needed services. Further, an administrator serves well in providing unusual ideas which faculty can use to add distinction to the college. Perhaps the greatest administrative service is using powers delegated to an administrator to accomplish all that the university community desires.

III

A third and at least equally important factor which inhibits the development of needed organizational innovations is the widespread and mistaken idea that a college or a university has overarching and controlling purposes. Wherever this misconception is used, results can be disastrous. As Henry Winthrop points out in the

Fall 1965 issue of the *Educational Record:*

> Instead of fostering the ideal that the school should provide intellectual leadership for the community, the modern university is taking orders and cues from vested interests off campus and is largely confining its thinking and research to the task of implementing the values of the community which controls it.[7]

James Killian, Jr., points to the same problem in the December 1965 issue of the *Atlantic*, where he writes:

> Our society tends steadily to assign new duties to the universities—as, for example, the current proposals that universities become agents of urban service and renewal. They are called upon to assist small colleges, carry knowledge to the people, run special programs for the disadvantaged, undertake curriculum development projects, and manage summer institutes to train teachers to teach the new curricula.[8]

The effects of overarching and controlling purposes upon the behavior of personnel of an organization have been studied thoroughly, the best known example being *The Organization Man* by William H. Whyte, Jr. Conformity, even in dress; devotion of one's whole self to service to the organization; safe associations outside of working hours; other-directed personalities; and guessing what the boss wants are likely to be found frequently among members of formal business groups with a controlling purpose. Further, such characteristics are often used when selecting new employees, thus increasing their frequency as marks of membership. Among some formal academic groups other behaviors are expected.

---

[7] Winthrop, Henry. "Needed Reconstruction in Education for a Cybernating Society." *Educational Record* 46: 410; Fall 1965.

[8] Killian, James, Jr. "Teaching Is Better Than Ever." *Atlantic* 216: 53; December 1965.

Members are required to choose their own attitudes, to pursue further knowledge, to publish scholarly material.

Where these purposes arise from a particular philosophy, faculty are expected both to accept the philosophy and conform to the purposes. Some writers about higher education consider this imposition to be a virtue. Ordway Tead, in an article entitled "Higher Goals for Higher Education" (*Educational Record*, July 1962), argues for acceptance of goals related to morals and character as among several of the higher goals:

> . . . There has been too much professional equivocation about the influences of logical positivism, unalloyed ethical relativism, symbolic logic, a mechanistic scientism, and a materialistic humanism. There has been in college teaching a slighting or ignoring of the spiritual career of humanity so far as the religious and philosophical disclosures of a long line of saviors, prophets, seers, artists, and profound thinkers are concerned. A purpose of moral spiritual commitment, emphasis and dedication is in need of vigorous affirmation. This can be done above and beyond the secular and the sectarian by means of an empirical idealism.[9]

Undoubtedly, as a number of church-controlled colleges and universities have demonstrated, a controlling moral purpose with its underlying philosophy can be used to select faculty and to shape educational programs. But one questions whether or not many of these institutions reach a level of quality comparable to that of others where faculty are free to believe and teach the truth as they discover it. And one can also question whether or not the few church-controlled colleges which have achieved greatness have continued to use the tests of faith in selecting faculty and in shaping programs. Such tests, in the long run, are more likely to restrict than to expand an institution's growth in excellence.

---

[9] Tead, Ordway. "Higher Goals for Higher Education." *Educational Record* 43: 190; July 1962.

IV

I have stated that a new unit will replace the department as the primary element in college organization. I have argued that administration will become a service to faculty and students. I have urged rejection of controlling purposes of a university. And I have taken these three positions because I believe them to be among the essential characteristics of an organization within which intellectual leadership can develop: intellectual leadership which man can follow across all frontiers. Now I will sketch the broad outlines of a different organization of a university. The true nature of a university exists in two distinct but related ways, as a state of mind and as a charter of behaviors which accompany and reinforce the state of mind.

The state of mind which constitutes a university, like that which Barbu[4] describes as constituting the democratic way of life, consists of the elements which follow.

The first state of mind is a feeling of change. Members of the university feel that both their scholarly and their university lives are in a permanent state of transformation and readjustment. This feeling arises out of the effects of continuing inquiry upon persons who pursue the truth. They have learned, like Dr. Stockmann in Ibsen's *An Enemy of the People,* that

---

[4] Barbu, Zevedi. *Democracy and Dictatorship.* New York: Grove Press, 1956.

> . . . a normally constructed truth lives as a rule, let us say, fifteen, sixteen, at the most twenty years, seldom longer. But such aging truths become terribly lean and tough. And the majority, having first of all been created by them, later recommends them to humanity as healthy spiritual food. But I can assure you that there is not much nourishment in such food. I must speak about this like a doctor—all the truths belonging to the majority are like ancient rancid bacon or like rotten green ham; and from them comes all the moral scurvy which is eating itself into the life of the people around us.

Most scholars are among the minority who reject ancient truths and seek new ones. They have learned to revise what they have learned as they continue to learn; to look at changes in truth and in themselves as both inevitable and good. As members of the academic community, scholars have seen it change as a result of individual scholarship and of faculty actions. They have found the new to be better than the old. They have learned to seek and to expect change in the university. Those few members of the academic community who cannot tolerate continual change should reexamine their motives for remaining within it.

A second state of mind that constitutes a university is belief that the growth of the university is determined from within. As just stated, the two categories of changes which are closest to members of the university community, knowledge and the university itself, are perceived as arising out of faculty efforts. Continuing experiences in pursuit of truth and in the improvement of the university convert perceptions into convictions. In other words, members of the university believe that they can shape the academic world and thereby influence the society of which it is a part.

A third state of mind is belief in the inner and individualized authority of each member of the university. Faculty members believe that administrative power has been delegated from the faculty so that the university community may be governed in an orderly manner. Faculty members recognize that both authority and power to act are attributes of successful administration, but they perceive these attributes as arising out of faculty consciousness of their necessity and consequent faculty decision to bestow them upon administrators, who thus both become representatives of the faculty and provide needed services to the faculty. The university, then, is a representative social order in which authority is delegated, yet never transferred; it remains inner and individual.

Confidence in reason is the fourth state of mind which constitutes the university. Actions of the faculty are carried out on the presupposition that they will finally be adjusted to a pattern based on reason. Confidence in reason is necessary to the belief that there is order and stability in change. For through reason, men grasp the concept of the unity in diversity but never ignore diversity. Confidence in reason leads to belief that a faculty can meet, deliberate upon its own interests, find common goals, and choose actions to reach them; confidence in reason leads to belief in the faculty's capacity for self-legislation.

The clusters of behaviors which together with the states of mind just described constitute the true nature of the university are not always obvious. These behaviors can be clustered into four general categories: individuality, critical mind, objectivity, and leisure.

The discussion which follows, like that of the states of mind, is based upon Barbu's ideas.

The first category of behavior which constitutes the university is individuality. The behaviors of individuality, as exhibited by faculty members, fall into two distinct classes: those of unique persons and those of members of the university. As a professor pursues his work in its full richness, he is a unique person; as he acts with others to improve the university, he is a member of a formal group. The behaviors of individuality are at their best in the university when there is balance between opportunities to work alone and opportunities to work with others.

A second category of behavior is the critical mind. A member of the university exhibits the behaviors of the critical mind when he accepts or rejects propositions, takes a course of action prompted by his own judgment, interprets a situation through his intellect. Through these actions he acquires knowledge based on observation and formulates principles governing relationships among things and events. Perhaps the supreme behaviors of the critical mind occur when a professor has learned how to learn and how subsequently to modify his own behavior and personality.

The behaviors of the critical mind are accompanied by an attitude described by Charles Sanders Peirce:

> Upon this first, and in one sense sole, rule of reason, that in order to learn you must desire to learn, and in so desiring not to be satisfied with what you already incline to think, there follows a corollary which itself deserves to be inscribed upon every wall of the city of philosophy. Do not block the way of inquiry.

The third category of behavior is objectivity. The behaviors of objectivity are shown when a professor looks at the world and the university through categories of otherness; when his mind grasps and uses the non-self or the non-identical as having reasons for their existence. Objective behavior occurs only when he has become able to balance the "me" and the "not me" without reducing one to the other. Objective knowledge, the rational basis for objective behavior, arises when the behaviors of individuality and of the critical mind combine fruitfully.

The last category of behavior is leisure. The behaviors of leisure are necessary both for the use of the critical mind and for the development of objective behavior. Use of the critical mind is jeopardized by feelings of pressure; objective behavior is jeopardized by lack of flexibility. The behaviors of leisure are characterized by two attitudes—(a) a willingness to engage in activities without concern for practical or useful results and (b) contemplation, a willingness to disengage oneself from daily cares and immediate duties and to view life, the world, and the university as an onlooker. The first attitude is seen most commonly in the ordinary affairs of life as willingness to play or to watch sports and games. In the university, however, it is seen most frequently in scholarly pursuit of knowledge without concern for others' use of what is discovered. Here, it is necessary for individuality to develop. The second attitude, rarely observed in the ordinary affairs of life, encourages the growth of objectivity. Both attitudes call for use of the critical mind.

V

Organization is needed if the university is to operate, but it cannot be developed successfully from models derived from industry, government, or any source where the true nature of the enterprise differs from the true nature of the university. *What are the characteristics of an organization which will produce the state of mind and the behaviors which constitute the true nature of the university?*

First, the purposes of the organization do not control the behaviors and attitudes of its members. Rather the university is a flexible instrument used to produce intellectual leadership. Thus its internal structure, composed of new units rather than departments, must be designed to encourage its members toward freedom to choose their own attitudes and behaviors. When this is done, its main functions are to produce both the emotional and intellectual climates in which faculty and students will continue to learn, in which they will strive to learn how to learn and how to acquire more fully the attitudes and behaviors which constitute the university. Another function of the university is to provide the material resources for the production of these climates.

Second, a university organization creates a feeling of ease among its members by enabling each professor and student to achieve to the full extent of his capacities, to achieve in cooperation with others what he cannot achieve by himself, and to seek other channels for achievement when he cannot find them in the university.

But these characteristics do not imply that either the university or the individual act with complete spontaneity; on the contrary, both observe four guiding principles which are never rigidly applied but which are often displayed in the acts of individuals—tact, politeness, decency, and a sense of humor. These accepted norms of action are reflected in the way faculty and students feel about the university. Each person is a selective center in which factors of the university environment are organized in terms of his needs to form the attitudes and behaviors which constitute the university. An organization, to become a university, must provide an atmosphere in which these guiding principles are present and applied.

Third, a university institutionalizes the ambitions of faculty and students. Ambition constitutes a driving force toward differentiation and individualization as each scholar acts to learn, to discover, to teach, and to improve the university. The hierarchy of academic rank is patent evidence of institutionalized ambition.

Fourth, the university organization is characterized by tolerance of the bizarre, of the unique, of the congeries of differences which arise as individuals with the states of mind of the university use the behaviors of the university. Tolerance, a general flexibility in attitudes and behavior, is dominated by intellectual factors and develops best under conditions of leisure.

Fifth, an organization which becomes a university uses rational decision-making procedures which allocate values for the institution.[5] Each decision on policy denies certain things to some persons and makes them accessible to others. Obvious examples are budget allocations, added courses, and assignment of rooms for instruction. Choosing a policy always involves a prediction of what will result if each alternative under consideration were to be put into use. Prediction always involves uncertainty, which increases as the time when results will be achieved becomes more remote. Further, people will always differ over the desirability of these results. The states of mind and behaviors of the university encourage its members to persist in decision making based on reason.

---

[5] Much of the argument here is derived from T. L. Thorsen, *The Logic of Democracy*. New York: Holt, Rinehart, and Winston, 1962.

Despite what has been learned over the years, men have limited intellectual ability for predicting long-term results. Thus there would seem to be no logical way to prove one alternative to be the best. Out of the context of man's inability to prove the ultimate validity of a proposal to improve an organization springs the general recommendation that serves as the basis for a philosophy of university organization. This philosophy is a restatement of Pierce's sentence, "Do not block the road of inquiry." It is, "Do not block the possibility of change in the university."

University decisions always involve matters of preference, the ultimate rightness of which cannot be demonstrated. We have no way of knowing who will predict results most accurately. If we wish to discover the best current "truth" to govern us, rather than to be governed by tough, lean truths with little nourishment, every member of the university must be free to express any opinion in respect to any proposal for changing the university.

But decisions must be made, and they must be final and binding if action is to follow. Two test principles, consistent with the attitudes and behaviors which constitute the university, are the only ones which seem likely to produce decisions and actions after discussion. First is the majority principle. Procedures which allow the majority to decide, after rational and adequately prolonged consideration of alternatives, are essential. The second principle, delegation of power, I have already discussed.

Neither principle is merely methodological; both arise out of fallibility; both demand tolerance, tactfulness, politeness, decency, and a sense of humor. Both are necessary if the university organization is to reach its main goals, if the university is to create a feeling of ease, and if it is to institutionalize ambition which is characterized by tolerance. The essential element in all of these, freedom, comes only when method and substance are considered together. As Justice Frankfurter wrote, "The history of liberty has largely been the history of the observance of procedural safeguards." Liberty of the university and liberty within the university are critically necessary if it is to reach its full potential as an instrument through which man can produce the intellectual leadership which will guide him across his frontiers.

TRADITION AND INNOVATION IN TEACHER EDUCATION

The Rev. Charles F. Donovan, S.J.

The Eighth Charles W. Hunt Lecture

Presented at the Nineteenth Annual Meeting of
the American Association of Colleges
for Teacher Education
Chicago, Illinois
February 15, 1967

Rev. Charles F. Donovan, S.J., like Charles W. Hunt for whom this lecture series is named, is a product of New England. He was born in Boston on March 28, 1912.

After graduating from Boston Latin School, he earned his A.B. degree from Boston College and his M.A. degree in English from Fordham University. He pursued theological studies at Weston College, a Jesuit seminary, where he was ordained to the priesthood in 1943 and earned the S.T.L. degree in 1944. He later earned his Ph.D. in education at Yale University. Father Donovan's first teaching assignment was in the English department of his alma mater, Boston College, where he has served continuously throughout his professional career. He became chairman of the education department in 1948, first dean of the School of Education in 1952, academic vice-president in 1961, and senior vice-president in 1968. He continues in that last position and as dean of the faculty.

Father Donovan has been active in teacher education, serving as president of the New England Teacher Preparation Association and the Massachusetts Council for Teacher Education, as well as a member of the Executive Committee of the American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education. He has written and spoken extensively on teacher education.

He was a member of the Executive Committee of the Association for Higher Education and is presently a member of the National Education Association, the Jesuit Education Association, the National Society for the Study of Education, and Phi Delta Kappa.

TRADITION AND INNOVATION IN TEACHER EDUCATION

BY THE REV. CHARLES F. DONOVAN, S.J.

THE EIGHTH CHARLES W. HUNT LECTURE

When our Association President, John King, called from Wyoming to invite me to give the annual Charles W. Hunt Lecture this year, my first impulse was to warn him he was taking quite a chance. I didn't warn him, however, because I prized his invitation so highly. But just how much of a risk John King took I will leave for you to judge after telling you he invited as opening speaker a clergyman whose involvement in teacher education has kept him from setting foot in a pulpit for fifteen years. What a temptation this is.

Seriously, I am proud to have the opportunity to address my colleagues, associates, and friends in teacher education and feel especially privileged, because of my deep affection and admiration for Charles Hunt, to have a share in the lecture series by which we honor him.

I have taken as my theme "Tradition and Innovation in Teacher Education." I hope it will not be considered parochial if I use, as a springboard to my theme, some reflections on contemporary experience in the Catholic church in which both tradition and innovation have peculiar significance in the religious ferment that people (both inside and outside the Catholic church) recognize as one of the unique happenings, in no beatnik sense of the word, of the twentieth century. Indeed there is ferment in the church. The implications and ultimate results of this ferment are undoubtedly read differently by different observers.

I was surprised—perhaps even more than by John King's flattering call—to get a call not many weeks ago, in the middle of the usual mundane desk chores of a typical administrator's morning, from a lady reporter for *Time Magazine* who casually asked in her opening sentence if I would care to comment on the impending schism in the Catholic church.

May I say parenthetically that it is some kind of tribute to teacher education that *Time* should regard as a presumably prominent character in the Catholic church a clergyman who holds no church office, who has not been a theologian, who hasn't even had a chance to aspire to become a reverse-collared Billy Graham, and whose only platform for gaining a hearing by anyone on any subject has been—until last June—the deanship of a school of education. This is, I submit, some kind of feather for teacher education's cap. Indeed I might have felt less startled if the lady had cast me in the role of an authority on the National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education.

But I manfully grappled with the questions she posed—trying to be balanced, prudent, and honest—and ended up, as one usually does in such situations, sounding as if my brain were made of warm marshmallow. She let me know at the end of twenty-five minutes that my views were less than apocalyptic, and I somehow felt I had let *Time Magazine* down. Be that as it may, that call, which would have been inconceivable ten years ago, was symptomatic. The tides of change are running, and some wonder if we will look on the same shoreline again.

The *Aggiornamento,* the updating of the church that good Pope John called for, is proceeding too fast to please some and too slowly for others. John said, "Open the windows"; and while some complain of the draft, others seem bent on tearing down the walls. There have suddenly developed liberal (or, depending on one's viewpoint, radical) and conservative (or obstructionist) camps in the church, not as organized movements but as styles of thinking. There are tensions that did not exist before or at least were not articulated before. Among the young are found the same idealism, restlessness, impatience with convention, rebelliousness, and at times the ill-focused urge for involvement that characterize today's young people in the wider society, particularly on our college campuses. Most of this is good. The ferment bespeaks a vitality that images the energy of that amazing octogenarian who started it all, John XXIII. Depending on one's temperament, it is a heady or bewildering time to be a Catholic. Change is pervasive. It greets you daily in small ways, such as dropping the ancient expression "Holy Ghost" and substituting "Holy Spirit," and in large ways, such as broadening the base of decision making.

A few years ago permission was granted for priests to read their daily assigned prayers, the divine office, in the vernacular instead of Latin. After the permission was granted, various publishing houses didn't wait for fresh and up-to-date translations but rushed into print with whatever translations they could find, with the result that the new English breviary hymns are in the style of nineteenth century English divines. One of my fellow Jesuits is bothered by the fact that a hymn which is read often is translated with an *aabb* rhyme scheme; the final couplet in the original translation obviously ran like this: "Praise the Lord, ye heavenly host, Father, Son, and Holy Ghost." But to conform to the new practice, the publisher simply ignored the rhyme and printed the concluding couplet as follows: "Praise the Lord, ye heavenly host, Father, Son, and Holy Spirit." This lack of a final rhyme bothers my friend; and my one contribution to the new liturgy, which no one has adopted but which seems to be in keeping with the more familiar and popular ecclesiastical style our young people are promoting, is this rhymed version of that concluding couplet: "Praise the Lord, let's really hear it for the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit."

Innovation and experimentation have become so much a part of our daily experience that even a senescent priest is moved to try his hand at liturgical creativity. Indeed, change is rejuvenating and exciting; it is an essential order of the day not only for churches, of course, but for all social organizations that wish to stay alive, and that includes teacher education and the American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education.

Change can be either evolutionary or revolutionary. It can extend, modify, and improve the basic traditions of the organization or it can ignore, contradict, and, either intentionally or unintentionally, destroy those traditions. I believe there are traditions in American teacher education —traditions that AACTE has been a principal agent in fostering—that we would be ill-advised to abandon. Even in a conference—indeed especially in a conference focusing on "Changing Dimensions in Teacher Education"— we may well devote a few minutes to recalling some of the enduring values which hopefully will undergird any new dimensions or innovations we may promote or embrace.

The first tradition I would praise has to do with the humble origins of teacher education in this country: the normal schools, the struggling teachers colleges, the underprivileged education departments in colleges and universities. There is something essentially American about our story. Like the pioneers of this country, our precursors were not among the affluent or the privileged. I know it is practically un-American at this point in history to praise poverty, and that is not my intention. But those of us who grew up in the Depression can exchange stories about some of the fine by-products of those hard times—stories of sharing, of sacrifice, of small heroisms, of simple family joys. And I think there are precious by-products of the plain origins of teacher education, such as simplicity and realism, practicality, the common touch, closeness to the people, commitment to service, and absence of pretentiousness and snobbery. The pioneering days of teacher education are by no means in the distant past for all of us and may not be over for some of us; but, by and large, the affluence of American society has begun to touch us; and many of you will say, "It's about time." And yet may I voice the prayerful hope that affluence will not spoil us nor rob us of the homely virtues of our past.

The story of "Bringing Up Father" is a classic gloss on American cultural evolution, the familiar pattern of the nouveau riche contemning their unglamorous antecedents and affecting the mode of high society. Not so long ago the surest path to social prestige for the heirs of successful immigrants to this country was to marry or buy into European royalty. The fawning social climber, blinded to the values of his own environment and hungry for instant social prestige, has become an object of pity.

But is there not a kind of academic climbing that is just as pitiful and of graver import? In the process of the necessary and usually wholesome evolution of teachers colleges into state colleges and universities, isn't there a danger of trying so hard to justify a new institutional title that vestiges of the earlier honorable identity may be suppressed? It is painful to hear of former teachers colleges which seek to establish academic purity by adopting a snobbish value system that downgrades professional education. As federal and state grants for teacher education become more generous, as regional educational laboratories and research and development centers involve more of our institutions, and as funded projects engage more of our time, there is an inevitable danger of our becoming overly busy, distracted, and remote, with less of the genuine humanitarianism and concern for people that have been our tradition. It is not, of course, wealth itself that is to be feared. For too long, teacher education has been shamefully undersupported. The peril is that we will not use wealth wisely. If we use it wisely, then we will not lose that simplicity, democratic openness, and singleness of purpose that have marked our past.

A second characteristic of American teacher education we would do well to preserve is the unity we have achieved while preserving diversity. Here again we reflect the best in American tradition. We salute the vision and openness of AACTE's parent organizations, the National Association of Colleges and Departments of Education, the National Association of Teacher Education Institutions in Metropolitan Districts, and the American Association of Teachers Colleges, which could have perpetuated an exclusive club in teacher education but instead chose the high road of inclusiveness, opening the organization to any kind of institution—public, private, or church-related—seriously committed to the education of teachers. Of course, we recognize the influence of Charles Hunt in the critical decision to make AACTE embracing and universal.

The solidarity of American teacher education is a grass-roots phenomenon. Unlike certain influential academic associations in America, it was not an initial compact among a select group of prestige or giant institutions to form an organization into which developing institutions would then have to fight their way, and only on terms established by the in-group. Rather our organization was broadly and democratically based, and mighty and prestigious universities were invited to membership along with every other college doing a manful job of preparing teachers. We are not only *e pluribus unum*, we are *e diversis unum*. Within a generously broad framework, we have encouraged free enterprise in teacher preparation. Our differences have not divided us; but rather, in the open forum of AACTE, we have communicated and shared experiences with one another, and this sharing has strengthened teacher education nationally. Ours is a record of democracy and openness rivaled by few educational organizations in America, and we should jealously maintain the tradition.

We have had faith in teacher education. Given our profession and the very title of our association, it is almost tautologous to mention this. But in contrast to those who have held–and hold today–that teachers are born or are the natural product of a liberal education, we have maintained that there are educational ways–formal and informal, curricular and extracurricular–by which the likelihood of teaching success, and in a broader sense, of school success can be promoted. Putting the matter more narrowly, we have also had faith in teacher education at the undergraduate level; and I think this is a tradition we should be slow to discard.

Many of the same people who said twenty years ago that all a teacher needed was a liberal arts education are now saying that the only respectable path to a teaching career is a four-year liberal arts program plus a fifth year of professional education and experience. We need not quarrel about the number of years. Soon we may be defending the proposition that a person is not ready to teach until seven years after secondary school. I distinguish here between the time it takes to prepare a teacher, which is not my present question, and the appropriate time for *beginning* teacher preparation. I reject what is for some the dogma that the first four years of higher education must be "undiluted" liberal arts, that not until the future teacher is twenty-two years old should he study a child or consider the process of schooling or think of his profession.

The typical liberal arts college lists a rich melange of courses from astronomy to zoology, any of which apparently may be studied by prospective teachers with no threat to the integrity of their liberal education. The only things, we are to believe, they must not study are the child, the school, and the process of human learning. Any time now we can expect one of the foundations to give several million dollars to subsidize undergraduates who aspire to be teachers so that they may live away from home during vacations and not run the risk of associating with younger siblings or neighborhood children, which might give them pre-A.B. notions of what youngsters are like.

We can even imagine the development, under another grant, of a selective memory pill, which prospective teachers could take on entering college to suppress all memory of their own childhood and schooling so that they could come to graduate professional education with uncontaminated minds, like John Locke's *tabulae rasae*.

If my sarcasm is showing, it is because I scorn the doctrinaire position of those who would eliminate any kind of teacher preparation from the undergraduate experience. Indeed, the recent history of American higher education might indicate that it is the so-called undiluted liberal arts pattern that is in for reexamination. It is not the undergraduate engineering, agriculture, pharmacy, nursing, or education major who is alienated on our campuses. Rather, it is the professionally uncommitted, academically purposeless, career-confused arts majors who are our problem; and I for one don't want to see our schools staffed with people recruited exclusively from that population.

The advocate of undergraduate teacher preparation is not committed to what we have been doing or are now doing at the undergraduate level for future teachers. We may develop quite different strategies and experiences for undergraduates in the years ahead. However, underlying any changes will be the enduring value of fostering or developing commitment to a teaching career and giving an appropriate orientation and apprenticeship for that career in undergraduate years. That has been our overwhelming tradition, and I hope it will continue.

Inextricably linked to the tradition of undergraduate teacher education is our tradition of concern for undergraduates and undergraduate teaching. At the present moment when large numbers of the academic profession are engaged in breast-beating over their neglect of undergraduates—while others wish the undergraduates would go away and the administrators worry about the next explosion from resentful student bodies—we can take pride in our record of closeness to students and commitment to the importance of the undergraduate classroom.

Perhaps we shouldn't take undue credit for this, since ours is essentially a people-oriented profession and the nature of our job demands that we look upon the undergraduate not merely as a faceless recipient of learning but as a person hopefully evolving into a certain kind of agent or doer, a teacher. But we are part of the emerging pattern of higher education, and, as is true of other institutions, our enrollments are growing apace, our graduate programs are burgeoning, our research involvements multiply, and our community service commitments expand. The same factors that have led to dwindling attention to undergraduates by other sectors of higher education confront us, and only deliberate fidelity to our tradition will keep us from following the anti-student road. We have a unique professional obligation and opportunity to show the way to the rest of the academic community in the appropriate blending of research and teaching. Taken globally, our record in research is not as impressive as our record in teaching. It might be said that the tradition of research is in its infancy among us. May that tradition mature and prosper, but not at the expense of teaching nor of personal engagement with undergraduates.

The theme of this lecture is "Tradition and Innovation in Teacher Education." As I have spoken of some of the traditions of teacher education which I believe have enduring value for the future, I have spoken with some sentiment. In so doing, I have been reminded of a great teacher of mine who used to ask, "What's wrong with sentiment?" But to dwell exclusively upon tradition, to expend one's energies solely upon the preservation of the best of the past is to begin to lose the race with rigor mortis.

If I may revert transitionally to the religious analogy with which I began, I would make my own a statement of the poet-turned-monk, Thomas Merton, in his recent book, *Conjectures of a Guilty Bystander.*[1] "I would like to think," says Merton,

---

[1] Merton, Thomas. *Conjectures of a Guilty Bystander.* Garden City, N. Y.: Doubleday, 1966. 320 pp.

"that I am what Pope John was—a progressive with a deep respect and love for tradition—in other words, a progressive who wants to preserve a very clear and marked continuity with the past . . . yet to be completely open to the modern world."

If we in teacher education are to have a meaningful future as well as a history, we must first know the modern world, not just the part we like or are used to or are comfortable with, but the whole of it including aspects that are disturbing because they are new and resist assimilation into old attitudinal and thought patterns. Secondly, we must expect innovation, welcome innovation, adjust to innovation, and promote innovation in education. Some of the innovations we should anticipate have to do with making up deficiencies in past practices, while others will stem from new developments in our environment.

One of the stirring conflicts of our recent past was that between society-oriented and intellect-oriented professors, between the advocates of life adjustment and the advocates of academic mastery. It is now clear that both parties must be victors. Future teachers at all levels of education, including elementary school, must have an academic major besides professional education. This is imperative not only to provide teachers who have had the experience of scholarly concentration but also to provide teachers who are academic specialists in or out of a teaching team.

Speaking of team teaching and its city cousin, interdisciplinary teaching, we will hardly be consistent in exploring and advocating such practices for the schools if they are not operative in our own institutions. Standard courses such as psychology of learning and educational philosophy may take on a new look with contributions from professors of anthropology, political science, economics, sociology, and history. Indeed much of the conventional content of such courses may be mastered through new electronic instructional aids, as I will mention later.

At any rate, a major goal of the next decades should be the healing of the scandalous schism between education faculties and professors of the academic disciplines. Short of some kind of academic Sadie Hawkins Day, you may wonder how this desired liaison is to be effected, since we are not presently swamped with overtures from our academic colleagues. Because of the disciplinary chauvinism and/or myopia that pervades academe, it would be utopian to think that there will ever be any more harmony between academicians and education professors than between, let us say, physicists and linguists. But the carrot of federal grants has already lured social scientists especially, but scientists and humanists as well, out of the ivory tower and laboratory into the school world. National Defense Education Act institutes, Office of Economic Opportunity projects, and United States Office of Education grants have revealed to the eyes of many of our colleagues the existence—the sociologically exciting, economically staggering, academically critical, and research-ripe existence—of the schools; and there is nothing like extended contact with real schools and real children and real teachers to modify the armchair dogmatism of academic professors. Many of them are beginning to see things for the first time as we have seen them for generations, and a few of them even appreciate our insights and know-how. This trend towards the involvement of professors of many disciplines in school-related projects is bound to develop; and, provided we welcome the expertise of our colleagues from other disciplines and demonstrate how much can be accomplished by our complementary efforts, the historical gap between us may markedly diminish.

If there is need for even greater academic strength in our institutions and their products, of more immediacy is the need for increased social sophistication among us and in the teachers we send into the schools. Up to now, the dominant disciplinary influence on teacher education has been psychology, with a secondary influence by what we may call social philosophy, as in progressive and life-adjustment education. We may now move into an era in which sociology will make the most effective contributions to a new style in teacher preparation. This will not imply a neglect of psychology, because one of the major gains from sociology will be the light it casts on the effect of social determinants on psychological processes.

Teachers must be increasingly aware of the social matrix in which the child operates and by which he is conditioned and must learn to take it into account in their teaching. At the same time, teachers must be conscious of the social ideas of the community and nation that the schools are principal instruments in implementing. It is not just academic or textbook sociology that will be needed. Teachers need to be immersed in the smell and taste and throb of the social realities of cities and suburbs and homes and neighborhoods and gangs that children bring to school with them. They must also be abreast of the ideas and strategies of government, welfare agencies, churches, and scholars for the amelioration or elimination of unwholesome social environments.

In the school of the future, some of the routine teaching functions of teachers may be more efficiently handled by machines, and—with more time at their disposal and indeed with some change in their professional responsibilities—teachers, who traditionally have been regarded as applied psychologists, will spend much of their time as applied sociologists. This means greater realistic contact between schools and the community than has yet been established. Vocational education, for instance, has not kept up with the rapid changes in the job market caused by technology and automation. The requirements for college admission have remained relatively stable, and so our schools have been doing good-to-superb work in their college preparatory programs. But the preparation of non-college-bound youngsters for the real world of work has been poor-to-pitiful, because the schools are training children for jobs that no longer exist and are not providing training for the new kinds of work.

The federal poverty programs—and particularly the special stress on the inner city and disadvantaged—have pointed up the need for increased attention to the sociological dimension of education with obvious implications for teacher education. While we must provide all teachers with the necessary social sophistication, the greatest urgency exists for training teachers for work in inner city schools. Several tentative and experimental steps have been taken in this direction; but by and large, there has not been sufficient recognition of the need to give special training and equipment to teachers who will deal with the problem of the urban poor. Teachers with different cultural backgrounds and value orientations communicate poorly with the ghetto child. In addition, our teacher preparation programs have typically equipped teachers to cope with curricular materials and administrative structures geared for the majority middle class.

Our institutions will have to develop radical new programs: first to overcome in prospective teachers the affective obstacles to teaching in the inner city schools, and secondly to equip them with new technologies in the form of curriculum materials to meet the real needs of the urban poor. One has only to read Claude Brown's *Manchild in the Promised Land*[2] to recognize this desperate and immediate need in teacher education. It is totally unrealistic to suppose that financial endowment, however massive, can change the ghetto poor into middle class citizens. Even should we live to see the guaranteed annual wage for all, our city schools will still be dealing with culturally underprivileged children for years to come.

Once we know more about the characteristics, needs, and capabilities of these faultless victims and more about strategies for teaching them, we will be in a position to begin training teachers specifically to work with them. Getting middle class teachers-in-training to want to work with children who are poor and culturally backward is in itself a challenge of serious proportions. Here, too, we must invent or improve strategies for influencing the attitudes of people in our institutions so that they don't all wind up wanting to work with bright children in the suburbs who have far less need of teacher intervention than youngsters in the slums.

---

[2] Brown, Claude. *Manchild in the Promised Land.* New York: Macmillan Co., 1965. 415 pp.

We have to come to appreciate with Havighurst that the values schools should promote—such as orderliness, inhibition of aggressive impulses, a rational approach to a problem situation, desire for a work career based on skill and knowledge, desire for a stable family life, and desire for freedom of self and others—are not class values but have equal validity for slum and suburb. It is true that middle class suburban families are more apt to support these values than lower class families, and so more emphasis on them and more work with parents is needed in inner city schools. The teaching of fundamental values basic to adequate living in a democratic technological society will occupy a significant place in schools and schools of education in the future, and sociology will have a significant role here. Because however one may feel about it, there is more likelihood of wide consensus on values empirically established by sociology than on values presented a priori by axiology.

The most dramatic innovations in education during the closing decades of this millennium will be technological. The revolution in information-processing through computer technology will profoundly affect our schools, and we must decide what the role of teacher education will be in this innovative era.

If we are able to solve the basic problems underlying the implementation of a technological approach to education, many—and perhaps most of the mechanical and fairly routine—activities now engaged in by teachers could be performed by some machine configuration. Much as we would like to think otherwise, the majority of teaching activities are at the skill level, little concerned with the development of higher competencies. If the drill and skill activities of teachers are transferred to machines, then teachers will be free to devote time to the many goals connected with higher competencies, attitudes, values, and social skills that we claim as desired outcomes of education.

It may well be that the school of the future will involve interpersonal learning arrangements only in areas where they are clearly useful and/or necessary. Teachers will give much of their time to guiding social learnings. Teachers may tend more and more toward the role of group counselor, conducting group sessions designed to give children experience at interpersonal tasks. Such groups might engage in game playing, discussion of current social problems of interest to them, and even social skills such as dancing. Role playing in adult social activities in the political and economic realms might be emphasized at later stages.

If the teacher's role develops in this direction, then it seems likely that the physical arrangement of schools will undergo some dramatic changes too. We might see schools organized less and less around classrooms and schedules and more around activities designed to allow the child to develop social skills and understandings.

A considerable portion of the child's time would be spent in communication with a device or a series of devices designed to present educational materials. The history of educational devices has not been a happy one. In recent years, education has been the target of manufacturing interests concerned more with profit than with educational effectiveness. Programmed instruction may be cited as an example. But we are assured that the more recent advances in computer-based presentation devices have a few advantages over their predecessors.

First, the capabilities of the new devices are no longer limited to a single theoretical framework. The traditional alternative to Skinnerian linear programming techniques, namely, branching, seems to have an opportunity of becoming a reality with computer hardware. This is so because for the first time it is possible to simulate the approach to instruction of a good teacher through a truly flexible information-handling device.

Second, it appears possible to simulate not only a good teacher but a combination of very good teachers.

Third, it seems at least theoretically possible to simulate the best teaching approach for a given student. Thus, for the first time it is feasible to talk about a truly individualized approach to instruction, one which would be geared to the unique capabilities and limitations of a given student. Pushing that idea a bit further, it is not inconceivable that no two students would go through an identical series of learning experiences. Each one's sequence would be geared to his diagnostic information and background of achievement. Computer technology holds the promise of making it possible, for the first time, to realize what has for years been a catch-phrase in education—individualizing instruction—by treating students individually.

There are those who feel that teacher educators and teachers generally are hostile towards technological advances, not only because of a vague though unfounded fear of machines replacing teachers, but perhaps, too, because the major bias of teacher education has been personal and humanistic, antithetic to the engineering-behavioristic view that undergirds the new technologies. Perhaps some of my computer-buff colleagues put me down as unsympathetic because I tell them their motto is an adaption of the title of Luther's well-known hymn: "A mighty FORTRAN is our god." But people may well get dreamy and excited about what computers may do to make education more effective, and we cannot afford to let our institutions impede progress by consciously—or, more likely, unconsciously—fostering in students attitudes that cripple them for the technological age in education. There is no call, of course, for any diminishing of the wonderful tradition among us of stressing human and humanistic values. But there is need for a new dimension, an attitude and expertise in our institutions that will enable us to keep pace with the technological revolution. If we do not adapt, we will be bypassed.

It is simply verbalizing the obvious to say that out of the new regional educational laboratories, the research and development centers, and from the newly formed industrial complexes concerned with education—such as General Learning Corporation, IBM-SRA, Xerox, and Raytheon—will come innovations for education. Most of these innovations will be infused directly into the schools, and unless teacher preparation faculties and programs are in lively contact with these developments, we will fall into the same trap as vocational education, educating for the job that used to be but not for the job as it now is.

One problem confronting strategists of innovation in education is the opposition to change among teachers themselves. They wonder whether they should write off teachers now in service and start educating an entirely new breed of teachers at the preservice level. But some feel that this would be too slow and that the major effort must be devoted to reeducating teachers in service. We undoubtedly will have a role to play in such in-service programs, but our major contribution—perhaps even more important than developing new educational devices and programs in our institutions for use in schools—will be educating future teachers, who have a greatly increased receptivity to changes that are likely to result in improved education.

Research attention to creativity and methods of fostering it have come none too soon, and it seems urgent that we convert our institutions into laboratories for creativity experimentation. All definitions of creativity include the note of flexibility, referring particularly to the attitude of willingness to experiment with new methods and procedures and the continuous search for better ways of doing things. We ourselves—in our administrative, faculty, and institutional thinking, planning, and arranging—should exemplify this creative flexibility in order to furnish an atmosphere and setting in which students will develop an openness and an appetite for innovation.

Unanswered questions challenge our concern: What is creative teaching? How is it nurtured? How does one teach for creativity? What learning experiences promote it? What are the conditions that best support it? Do the staffs at teacher education institutions have the imagination and creativity to make their own teaching practices exemplify what solid research findings tell them they should be doing? How can teachers at all levels, including of course those in our own institutions, reveal themselves to their students as thinkers and problem solvers in action rather than as purveyors of standard, known-in-advance solutions?

On the threshold of an era of innovation, our greatest concern must be the relevance of our programs and the relevance of the knowledge and methods of our faculties. AACTE might make a major contribution by initiating and gaining support for a program of federally financed study leaves for faculty members in teacher education to insure that professors who did their graduate study in the 40's and 50's will be equipped to deal with the educational strategies and problems of the 1970's.

In speaking to the theme "Tradition and Innovation in Teacher Education" as a keynote for the important papers and discussions to follow in this conference, I have had most consciously before me the spirit of the man to whom this address is dedicated. I am sure Dr. Hunt will not object if I compare him—in his grand age, his wisdom, his identification with tradition coupled with complete openness to new ideas—to that jovial man who mingled innovation with tradition in the Ecumenical Council. We in teacher education have honorable traditions we should prize and preserve. Yet life is invention as well as tradition. And we will build new traditions and advance our cause as we respond—and respond we will—to the clear challenge of the hour: *Aggiornamento.*

TEACHERS:
THE NEED AND THE TASK

FELIX C. ROBB

THE NINTH CHARLES W. HUNT LECTURE

Presented at the Twentieth Annual Meeting of
the American Association of Colleges
for Teacher Education
Chicago, Illinois
February 14, 1968

Felix C. Robb holds the A.B. degree from Birmingham-Southern College, the M.A. from Vanderbilt University, and a doctorate from Harvard University. Born on December 26, 1914 in Birmingham, he was a public school teacher in Alabama, and later an instructor of English, alumni secretary, then registrar, at Birmingham-Southern College. During World War II he served as a naval officer in Fleet Air Wing 15 in the Mediterranean theater of operations.

In 1947 Dr. Robb became assistant to the president of George Peabody College. For seven years he was dean of instruction there. From 1958 to 1960 he was chief of staff of the

Study of the College and University Presidency, with offices in New York and Princeton. In 1961 Dr. Robb was elected president of Peabody, a post he held until July 1966, when he assumed his present position as director of the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools.

Felix Robb has long been actively involved in educational, civic, and religious activities and organizations at national, regional, state, and local levels. He is the author of more than fifty professional publications and monographs. He is chairman of the federal government's Southeast Regional Manpower Advisory Committee and is a member of Phi Beta Kappa, the U.S. Department of Labor's Committee on Specialized Personnel, NEA's Citizenship Committee, American Council on Education's Joint Committee on Business and Education, a member of the Cleveland Conference, and a member of the board of the Southern Education Reporting Service.

TEACHERS:
THE NEED AND THE TASK
BY FELIX C. ROBB

THE NINTH CHARLES W. HUNT LECTURE

I am honored to present the ninth Charles W. Hunt Lecture to this distinguished gathering of national leaders in the education of teachers. This lecture annually recognizes the work and worth of thousands of teachers of teachers and most especially honors a great man, a pioneer and leader-ahead-of-his-time in teacher education, our own beloved Charlie Hunt. This occasion also affords us opportunity to look at ourselves, our institutions, and our profession.

If you detect in the abbreviation of my title (TNT) the possibility of a sudden, released strong force, do not expect an explosion tonight. I only intend to light a few fuses that have been lit before. Whether they fizzle out again or detonate on campuses with sufficient force to shake up faculties, administrations, and curriculums remains to be seen. The matter is largely in your hands.

Ever since the establishment of the first schools in this country, we who teach have occupied a pivotal position in the society. Heirs to a tradition of expanding and improving education, we and our forebears have compiled a record of substantial achievement. Let us recognize with modesty what has been wrought: not a perfect, or adequate, system of education—just the world's best for the largest number of people. For this I wish to pay tribute to the teachers and administrators of our schools, to the institutions and individuals preparing these teachers, and to the millions of American citizens who support schools with their money and challenge us with ever rising expectations. In the light of the critique that shall follow, it is important to recognize the enormous value and contribution of our schools and the quintessential role of teacher education in their development.

Education in America is highly pluralistic. To keep it democratic, close to the people, we have evolved through delegation of authority and other means such a dispersion of controls and influence and such variation in levels of financial support that wide and intolerable differences exist in quality ranging from the worst to the best schools in the land. This situation, which links degree of educational opportunity to geographic location, constitutes our most vicious and self-perpetuating form of public discrimination and national stupidity. It is an incongruous and indefensible circumstance in a country which espouses equality of opportunity for all and which has the resources to make good its promise. This is our Number One Educational Problem. With respect to this and other issues I will raise, I ask: What is teacher education's response?

Inherent in the huge educational enterprise required to serve our population of 200 million are many remarkable achievements, but many problems and deficiencies. The larger and more diverse the total system becomes, the more difficult it is to modify it to fit new conditions, to manage it effectively and efficiently, and to make it function well in the service of individual learners and in the national interest.

Education in this country engages more than sixty million people as students, teachers, specialists, or administrators. Twelve hundred colleges and universities have educated the two million teachers and administrators who staff our elementary and secondary schools. Of these institutions, the 774 members of AACTE bear most of the responsibility and provide most of the leadership in teacher education. Currently, the preparation of new teachers is divided almost equally in numbers among three types of institutions: the large universities, the colleges whose historic and major purpose is to educate teachers, and the liberal arts colleges interested in teacher preparation. The member institutions of AACTE are the chief recruiters and molders of America's teaching force for its nonprofit public and private schools. These colleges and universities are the principal centers for research and study about learning and teaching. They have the brainpower to create innovations and models for use in the schools. They carry out an important function in the continuing education of teachers in service. They analyze and advise school systems. They influence governmental programs in education at all levels. They have leverage.

But I fear that many teacher education institutions are not employing this leverage in a sustained attack upon the deepest problems that confront our troubled society. We have not sufficiently prepared our graduates mentally, emotionally, or professionally to grapple with the societal ills which we ourselves often lament but leave to other agencies. Young people have the energy, the ability, the idealism, the courage, and the inner drive required to be successful where we have failed. If we will identify what it is urgent to do, they will find a way to do it, and in the doing discover new value and new relevance in their academic and professional studies. Is teacher education responding with appropriate speed, vision, and vigor to this challenge? We must respond: we must be willing to move that "graveyard" called the curriculum; we must teach in terms that are relevant to the needs of a society that has a right to expect more from us, or else we risk the creation of new action agencies in the field we have long regarded as our private province.

Because a turbulent world is the true context of teacher education, I invite you to examine the prospect for a different world in the future and our role in dealing with problems that plague us and narrow the perimeters of hope for millions of citizens. You who are the teachers of teachers can help fill the appalling leadership gap in the critical and sensitive area of human relations. You can create imaginative new programs to put the energies and talents of teachers more directly on target; and you can occasionally resist another shining little innovation in order to consolidate gains and to follow through with what is already known to do but not done.

It is inconceivable that "business as usual" will get us to the year 2000. Therefore, I challenge the AACTE, as our "chosen instrument" in teacher education, to restudy our priorities and to outline boldly our options. I propose that we collaborate in a major reorientation of teacher education that can better cope with emerging educational dilemmas and with the needs of a changing society in a nation under stress.

The option to act is ours today. Tomorrow our options may be fewer and more circumscribed. Either we get our educational house in order or someone else will order it for us. Either we perceive better the problems and forces at work and build educational programs and responses to influence, reinforce, or redirect these trends as needed or vast pressures building up both inside and outside the society will explode with damaging, if not irreparable, results.

I. THE NEED

It is never easy or simple to identify, let alone comprehend fully, the nature and scope of our educational needs. The forces and influences that shape our lives and our educational programs and institutions are often less personal and local than they are global conditions in the never-ending struggle between freedom and enslavement, between enlightenment and ignorance, between health and disease, between peace and war, between wealth and poverty, between government and anarchy, between good and evil. These great polarities are strikingly vivid in their contrasts and leave no comfortable middle ground. These forces pull and tug at us and destroy our sense of wholeness.

Though we are staggered by the complexity, the enormity, and the universality of human issues and problems, let us be optimistic enough to believe there is no human condition so oppressive, so pervasive, or so difficult as to be immune to solution or amelioration by individual and collective efforts based on sound knowledge, concern, courage to act, and willingness to invest and sacrifice to achieve desired ends. Without such optimism, teaching and learning would be little more than exercises in futility.

INTERNATIONAL DIMENSION

The American educational dilemma is *international*. With tension mounting in scores of the earth's "hot spots," the United States is straining in a necessary effort to maintain equilibrium among the mature and the emerging nations of the free, the communist, and the uncommitted worlds. The large context for our lives is the perimeter of freedom.

Can we maintain or expand the perimeter of freedom? We see around the world two vast ideological systems in conflict: communism and democracy. In the process of interaction, each system is influencing the other. Education has its role to play in that confrontation, and teacher education institutions should remember that love of freedom is not inborn: it must be learned.

If peace—a remote prospect at the moment—were to come, the educational and manpower implications would be enormous. Momentary dislocations would be more than offset by the unprecedented billions of dollars that would be available for domestic purposes including education, and for alleviation of poverty and degradation throughout the world. Barring total war and destruction, the world will be made smaller, more interrelated, and more interdependent by modern transport and by a communications revolution.

Last month Dr. Ralph E. Lapp, nuclear scientist who worked on the original atomic bomb, told a college audience: "If half our 1,710 strategic missiles are converted into multiwarhead configurations, the United States will have eighteen times the kill capacity required to knock the Soviet Union out of the twentieth century." If the reverse of this is similarly possible, civilization may be on the brink of the ultimate catastrophe: incineration. To reduce that likelihood, every resource at our nation's command–including teacher education–should be bent toward the creation of a workable peace, and simultaneously, toward the mental, moral, and physical stamina required to endure if peace is not forthcoming.

We must recognize ourselves for what we have become–an affluent, envied minority in a hostile world ready to explode. Two-thirds of the earth's population is sadly underfed and ill housed. Few people in the United States die of starvation, but millions in India and other depressed countries die each year from malnutrition and hunger.

The world's explosive birth rate rivals nuclear warfare as a threat to mankind. Sixty-five million babies joined the human race last year. Millions of them, according to Dr. J. George Harrar, population expert and president of the Rockefeller Foundation, were "unwanted, unplanned for, and cannot be properly fed, clothed, housed, and provided with educational and other opportunities. . . ."[1]

This problem seems remote to Americans who at this moment are comfortably shielded from its effects. But unless the world's population is stabilized, pressures will build up within this century to threaten not only every man's chance for fulfillment but his chance for survival.

---

[1] Harrar, J. George. "Survival or Fulfillment." Address given at California Institute of Technology, March 7, 1967.

The base for world understanding is education. Irrespective of their levels or fields of concentration, prospective teachers need an introduction to the countries and cultures of the world, a substantial experience with a least one culture other than their own, and evidence that their professors recognize education's expanding international dimension. Members of AACTE, what will be your response?

ECONOMIC DILEMMA

The American educational dilemma of 1968 is economic. Local, state, and federal governments have large but inadequate resources with which to meet present needs, not to mention future demands; and this despite the fact that we are at the highest peak of prosperity in our history. With escalating costs of war and defense and the world monetary situation in doubt, we must be prepared to meet our educational commitments even if a further spiral of hurtful inflation comes or if we should experience the often-predicted downturn labeled a "recession."

Especially critical are the financial troubles of large cities and the rural areas. Neither in ghettos nor in impoverished small towns and rural areas are salaries and other working conditions adequate to attract and hold a sufficient number of teachers of quality.

Teacher education institutions should not remain passive. They must effect the consolidation of weak school districts into strong multidistrict or multicounty school systems that can cooperatively create culture concentrations, facilities, and central services comparable to those in the better urban and suburban school systems.

People are frustrated by their own traditions, loyalties, and jealousies which resist restructuring and reformation through multicounty and interstate coordinated attacks on educational problems that extend beyond the means of smaller or weak local school districts. They desperately need enlightened leadership in facing this issue.

Pending significantly higher minimum standards of quality imposed by states and maintained by increased and redistributed state and federal revenues, the pooling of resources to form stronger, larger schools is the only means of combating the shocking maldistribution of teaching competence that exists throughout the United States.

As regional accrediting agencies move slowly from a school-by-school to a systemwide basis for assessing quality, communities and states will be receiving clearer pictures of their educational strengths and disabilities. Meanwhile, a nationwide in-depth analysis of the distribution of financial resources in relation to quality among schools and school districts is overdue. The implications for teacher education of a study of where our best prepared teachers live and work are obvious. Can it be undertaken, or at least be promoted, by AACTE?

Of deepening concern, both around the world and here at home, are the contrasts between wealth and want, between conspicuous affluence and dire poverty. Millions of Americans, including teachers, are improving their economic position through education; but other Americans, many of whom neither read nor write the English language acceptably, are caught by the sharp decline in need for unskilled labor and their lack of education. What, for example, is teacher education's response in behalf of two million children who come to our public schools speaking a language other than English?

POLITICS

The educational dilemma is *political*. The full impact upon education of the recently affirmed principle of "one man, one vote" has not yet been felt as power shifts from rural areas and small towns to the big cities.

Organized political activism of teachers is a phenomenon which will accelerate. It assumes that every major policy decision in education is a political decision. It also assumes that teachers are now preparing to stop subsidizing poor schools by working in woefully inadequate circumstances and are intending to win more victories at the ballot box.

There is abundant evidence that the United States lags behind several other countries in the active involvement of its citizens in democratic processes. Teachers, above all others, should be exemplars in political citizenship–individually informed, involved, active. This desired state of political sophistication and participation is more likely to characterize teachers if they have been instilled, while still students, with their citizenship responsibilities and their political rights as teachers. It is not enough to leave this important aspect of education to happenstance. What is your institution's response?

SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY

The educational dilemma is *scientific* and *technical*. On December 15, 1967, it was announced to the world that scientists had synthesized the viral DNA molecule which can reproduce itself inside a cell and generate new viruses. The creation of life is a monumental landmark along a path of brilliant accomplishments in the physical and natural sciences.

Engineering genius and technological know-how have sent missiles to the moon, split the atom, transplanted a human heart, created television, and invented the digital computer. These and other notable achievements are altering our lives in significant ways.

In the sciences we find the most dramatic example of the "knowledge explosion." The power of knowledge is manifest as never before. The learned scholar who once could live out his days quietly in an academic "ivory tower" now finds his knowledge and his services both needed and saleable in the marketplace. In science, knowledge is power and is reported to double every fifteen years. The parallel obsolescence is perhaps even more difficult for us to cope with, for people do not like to hear that what they know is not so. Despite growing awareness among educators of the fallibility of facts, there lingers in the schools an inordinate reverence for them (facts, that is). Is this because concrete bits of data are comforting in a time of rapid change and unsettling social conditions?

Be that as it may, science, mathematics, and technology have shaped our world, industrialized us built our cities. The tools of science and technology moved us first around the seas with venturesome argonauts, then upward into outer space with astronauts, and now downward into the depths of the sea on the courage and skill of our newest breed of explorer, the aquanaut. These and other epic events in man's conquest of his environment pivot around people whose cultivated talents and inquiring minds were stimulated by perceptive teachers.

It now remains for teachers to utilize the new science of learning and the technology of instruction. Leaders of teacher education, *répondez, s'il vous plait.*

ARTS AND LETTERS

Our dilemma is *humanistic*. Whether growth of the creative arts and belles lettres would have been comparable to scientific accomplishments had the pre- and post-World War II investments in science and technology been matched by underwriting the work of painters, sculptors, musicians, poets, novelists, and philosophers is a matter for sheer conjecture.

For too long, the once dominant and proud humanities have received only token support for research and development. Yet this deprivation has perhaps encouraged a renewal of concern for good teaching, for ideals, and for values. It is to the humanists we look for a kind of guidance which no amount of scientism or materialism can provide.

Music and art have not yet made their maximum impact on our culture. If there is today a dearth of new literature and music of epic quality, does teacher education somehow share in this failure? What can the teachers of teachers do to help make good on the artistic, literary, and musical birthright of every child?

SOCIAL PROGRESS

The educational dilemma is *social*. Belatedly, we in teacher education are aware and concerned that sizable segments of our population have too long been denied their share in the benefits of a free, open, democratic society. These segments include fourteen million impoverished people in rural America, the millions who live in deteriorating urban ghettos, the Indian Americans, the Mexican Americans, and most of twenty million Negro Americans. These and others like them have been trapped by isolation from society's mainstream by low educational levels, by lack of marketable skills in an era of rapid technological advancement, by the national "bottleneck" of inadequate guidance, by nonavailability of appropriate vocational education, by inadequate health care, by weak schools—by a set of interlocking conditions that tend to perpetuate a vicious cycle of deprivation, low aspiration, impoverishment, and frustration. The opportunities and contributions of underdeveloped, underutilized people can be vastly enlarged for their own benefit and for the benefit of all. This should be done because it is *right*. This should be done *in spite of* riots, *in spite of* threats to immobilize cities, *in spite of* admonitions to burn, to kill, to destroy. With massive, concerted, sincere drives to eradicate the causes of human blight, we can and we must build a good society for all citizens.

Deterioration of the stability of the American family continues to place added burdens on schools and teachers. The rise in crime and juvenile delinquency is surely related to failures of the home and family. This problem of society gallops with the growth of cities and appears to be related also to quality of teaching and the student's perceived relevance of school to his needs and interests. The decline of religion as a guiding, or restraining, force in American life has also made a difference.

One in every five American families changes habitation each year. The mass migration from rural areas to the cities has created enormous problems for both city dwellers and those who remain on farms and in villages. Of late, the nation's conscience has awakened to the plight of the decaying "inner city." But as a significant new study entitled *The People Left Behind*[2] states, the rural poor have few spokesmen. Only recently has there been an awareness that riots in the cities have roots in rural poverty.

We cannot afford a plateau or a moratorium on progress in human rights. The radicals say education is too slow a process. It is up to us to disprove that assertion and to make teacher education a powerful catalyst in the expansion of opportunity, especially for those who suffer the cumulative effects of long-time poverty and cultural deprivation.

Our colleges and universities can become more vital places linked meaningfully to the greatest crusade in our nation's history if we will send a powerful and ever-growing stream of our best young teachers into the ghettos and the rural poverty pockets. We can help turn these rugged jobs into challenging, prestigious adventures in learning and living. We can do this for America. What will be our response?

---

[2] A Report by the President's National Advisory Commission on Rural Poverty. Washington, D. C., September 1967.

NEEDED COALITION

The dilemma of American education is *private* as well as *public*. No longer can our deepest problems be resolved by government alone. To look upon federal aid to education, or a federally guaranteed annual wage, as the ultimate panacea is a serious mistake. This attitude could lead to an ultimate dependence and a degree of collectivism that would hamper individual enterprise. Only a new partnership of the private and public sectors —government at all levels working effectively with business, industry, agriculture, labor, education, and the grossly underestimated human welfare organizations supported by religious groups —only an effective coalition of these agencies can match our aspirations and needs with the human and natural resources required to create communities that approximate the good society. The private sector has yet to be heard from fully, effectively. It can play a decisive role in meeting challenges and in providing leadership required to build a better order.

OUR PROFESSION

The educational dilemma is *professional*. The teaching profession is at this moment in considerable disarray. Are we headed toward a divided profession, with teachers in one camp and administrators in another? Are we to see local school boards buffeted like shuttlecocks in a badminton game between the forces of NEA and the rising group known as AFT? Is tough power politics the only way to gain the dramatic improvement in teacher salaries that must come if we are to maintain and develop quality in schools?

Are we forever going to fail to discriminate between important research and the flood of junk that masquerades under that label? Are we content with the interminable lag between the best that is known and the dissemination of such information to every school system for use and implementation? Are we who know the circumstances from the inside going to continue to sit around and tolerate the vast discrepancies in quality (and hence opportunity) between the best financed, best managed, most excitingly effective schools and those numerous weak, drab caricatures that deny millions of youngsters a fair chance at the starting line?

THE YEAR 2000

Speculation about life in the year 2000 is currently both a favorite parlor sport and a serious concern of scholars. It is important that leaders in teacher education join in such speculation and in serious planning for the twenty-first century. In this effort, participation with representatives of all the disciplines and with people from every segment of our society would be invaluable for education, especially in clarifying what kinds of teachers will be needed in the future.

Educational institutions notwithstanding, continuity of wisdom is so denied by the phenomenon of death and the willful avoidance of history's warnings in favor of firsthand experience that the human race has learned little from its mistakes of the past. The increased emphasis of ebullient youth upon the "now" (the vivid present) instead of the "then" (the dim past) and the growing dominance of youths twenty-five years of age or under in our country require a new basis for strategies of national survival and require a new basis for individual fulfillment.

The vectors of force leading from 1968 to the year 2000 can best be employed to produce the hoped-for "good society" if communities and nations develop comprehensive long-range plans incorporating all predictable factors and if they apply their highest intelligence and greatest political finesse to the systematic discovery of solutions to problems and to the identification of all reasonable routes to achievement of agreed goals. The effort would evolve in three phases. The operational responsibilities of teacher education would be a part of phase three.

First, we need charismatic political leadership of unprecedented quality to carry the nation through a democratic determination of national long-range goals and the means to achieve them. These means, based upon a synthesis of pertinent facts and assumptions, would include all rational routes to the desired goals with a timetable for intermediate targets. A "critical path" approach to the timing and direction of energy would reveal the state of progress at any given moment.

Second, using a systems approach, a comprehensive plan would be developed for achievement of the agreed goals for the nation and its communities. A stabilized population of perhaps 300 million Americans beyond the year 2000 would be hypothesized. Including the most advanced thought from the new field of ekistics, the plan would accommodate a lessening distinction between urban and rural living. Habitation would be developed in well-spaced corridor city-states linked to far-flung work, educational, and recreational opportunities by fabulous transportation and communications systems.

As the American Academy of Arts and Sciences has indicated, analysis and future planning should include factors such as governmental structures, community organizations, population—density, privacy, and interaction—biological factors in genetics and personality, intellectual institutions, adequacy of resources and energy sources, population and age, control of the environment, education and training, human capital, meritocracy, ethnic minorities, use of leisure, the planning process, and the international system.[3]

Only the finest specialized and general intelligence drawn from the ranks of humanists, scientists, and social scientists can produce a workable design for a better society. Built into the design would be a massive program of demolition, renovation, and construction in every area of human activity to rectify the results of past mistakes. New policies and procedures would minimize their repetition.

Third, to reap the potential benefits of cybernetics, automation, and industrial society, and to help insure a wise and just redeployment of human and natural resources, we need a revitalized system of education, including teacher education, that emphasizes man's humanity and prepares him for the profitable use of his knowledge, energy, and time.

I do not agree with those who say that machines will soon cause us to run out of useful work to do. But no amount of technological brilliance can save us from chaos unless education provides citizens with an understanding of their world and the nature of man. We need a broad background in ways of learning, with more adequate career guidance, and with a strong commitment to the only society that can be truly democratic—a society of learners with abundant formal and informal educative experiences universally utilized from the cradle to the grave.

---

[3] *Daedalus* 96:653-4; Summer 1967.

II. THE TASK

The task of 1,200 colleges and universities that prepare teachers for America's schools is formidable now and will become more so as we move toward the twenty-first century. I happen to believe the task of teacher education was not properly conceptualized at the outset and we have been a long time overcoming that handicap. Very early we compromised with quality and settled for a hodgepodge of teachers ranging all the way from the stunningly effective to the not-so-warm bodies. We settled for too many schoolkeepers who could fill a vessel but couldn't light a flame.

A dichotomy was created: professional educators overstressed techniques and underplayed the art and science of teaching while their academic brethren haughtily ignored schools and children. Too often teaching candidates were fed pap when what they needed was a diet of substance plus fruitful intellectual and professional friction with fellow students, professors, teachers in service, and children in learning situations.

Today elementary and secondary schools command better attention, and it is to their credit that universities and colleges are increasingly applying their full resources to the important business of educating teachers.

"TURNED ON" TEACHERS

Most of all, we ignored the fact that teachers, to be successful, must be exciting people. We produced too many teachers of the placid kind that students forget, or wish they could forget, instead of the memorable facilitators of learning they never forget. The cardinal sin of teaching is, and always was, dullness.

Of course we wanted gifted teachers with subject matter breadth and strength in a specialty. Of course we wanted professional-minded, technically skillful practitioners. Of course we wanted persons of character and emotional stability. Naturally we wanted dedicated career teachers. But we screened out some potential candidates because they didn't fit our stereotypes. We all but posted a warning sign, "No Boat-Rockers Allowed." We failed to put a premium on a precious ingredient: charisma.

The teaching profession needs one million "turned on" teachers who have the drive as well as the competence to make an adventure of every hour in the classroom: teachers who are fired from the heart as well as the head, and who are inventive enough to make learning synonymous with living. We need inquiring provocators, arousers of those "sleeping giants," the talented ones; developers of children in the great mid-ranges of ability; and patient, sensitive guides for those pupils whose special conditions of body and mind limit them and call for our best effort.

It is improbable that electrifying teachers for the elementary and secondary schools can be produced in large numbers except by "turned on" professors in the colleges and universities. These inspiring models of pedagogical excellence are in short supply. Nevertheless, there are more artists in collegiate classrooms than is commonly recognized. Administrators, and even faculty committees, can more readily count items in a bibliography, or dollars in a research grant, than they can know the number of times students are carried to the top of Olympus for a thrilling intellectual experience. Any university that downgrades teaching by failing to reward exceptional teaching power in a measure comparable to research competence is an unfit place in which to prepare teachers.

SALARIES AND SELECTIVITY

How can we rebuild the teaching profession around a strong corps of one million well qualified learning catalysts? To begin with, salaries must be increased sufficiently to attract and hold a larger share of the best minds and personalities. Realistically, this will never take place in an adequate dimension if the only approach is to be a prolonged sequence of demands for across-the-board increments of improvement for an ever-enlarging teaching force.

Neither the teachers' union nor the NEA and its affiliates are apt to look with favor on any system of teacher evaluation leading to merit pay. But merit pay offers one alternative which could be quickly funded to double the upper salary limit for teachers with maximum education, experience, and competence. Many citizens feel it is unfair and unfortunate to reward the least effective and the most effective teachers in a lockstep of identical remuneration based solely on length of tenure.

I am convinced that the combination of circumstances confronting us—such as economic stress (including taxpayer resistance, rising demands to show cause, and efforts to reduce deficit spending) and the absolute necessity of increasing salaries for teachers of greatest competence, experience, and dedication, plus the need to have more children sharing the benefits of learning under the tutelage of lively, inventive, exciting teachers —the combination of these factors dictates a drastic revision in qualifications for membership in the teaching profession. Instead of applauding NEA's goal of two million members, I raise today this question: Why not *one* million well qualified, genuinely professional teachers in the membership by 1978?

If there are now approximately two million teachers at work in all types and levels of education, I propose that we hold the line at this number for ten or more years by introducing greater selectivity in whom we admit and whom we retain. If we would do this as a self-disciplined profession, we would make significant progress toward improved quality of instruction.

To make this possible, school systems would need to employ effectively and economically nonprofessional teacher aides, technicians, and specialized professionals in an average ratio of at least one supporting person in the instructional program for each highly educated, carefully selected, well rewarded master teacher. Already, one in five public school teachers is assisted by one or more aides, but mostly on a limited, part-time basis.[4]

The use of full-time and shared assistants and specialists will relieve teachers of much routine drudgery, multiply their effectiveness, and enhance their status. More use of specialists in team teaching is a key to successful individualized instruction. The team concept is certain to grow. The medical profession has developed professional teams in which eleven out of each hundred are reputedly M.D.'s and the others are support personnel. By the same token, teachers and school administrators need to be oriented to the view that central staff members, from superintendents to custodians, are all members of the team that supports classroom instruction.

---

[4] *NEA Journal* 56:16; November 1967.

Obviously, the implications of this proposal are large both for local schools and for teacher education. Most of our machinery is geared to resist such an innovation. Only a purposeful teaching profession and an informed citizenry can translate the ideas of greater selectivity and expanded assistance for teachers into reality.

CURRICULUM BALANCE

So much has been written and said about the content of undergraduate and graduate courses for teachers that I shall leave the question of proper balance among general studies, academic specialities, and professional courses to others. It is old ground and, in terms of state certification regulations and institutional requirements, often a battleground. So long as we attempt to quantify education by rigid prescriptions of credit hours instead of emphasizing experiences, activities, and accomplishments, jockeying among vested interests for space and consecutive time in the overcrowded curriculum will continue.

OCCUPATIONAL EDUCATION

For most of their history, secondary schools, and to some extent elementary schools, have had their curriculums dictated by colleges. Many youngsters who will never attend college are being forced into college preparatory courses because nothing else is available. The time has come for spokesmen and leaders in teacher education to recognize the growing importance of broadly conceived occupational education in an industrial society. For the most part, we in teacher education have been asleep with respect to the world of work and have neglected preparation of teachers to staff vocational training programs. The field of occupational education—after years of malnutrition, second-class citizenship, and low status generally—is coming into its own. Alert teacher preparing institutions will recognize the growing importance of vocational teachers in the comprehensive high school, the post-high school, noncollegiate technical centers, and the two-year community junior colleges of an industrialized nation. They should similarly develop renewed interest in adult and continuing education and begin to explore the potentialities and problems of proprietary schools, where more money is spent for training than in all of public education.

PREPRIMARY CHILDREN

Early child development is proving to be an exciting frontier for teacher education. Bold experiments have modified our notions of what can and should be taught to very young children and have modified our strategies for learning. These enormous gains in knowledge about young children and their capabilities have major implications for curriculum revision ranging from the first grade through the graduate school. If American education is to receive a thorough overhaul, we should break with the past and rebuild from the ground up, not from the top down.

Innovative programs are now enabling some children three years old to read, write, and reason at levels previously held to be impossible. "Head Start" programs have dramatized the potentialities of culturally disadvantaged children when given enthusiastic and competent teaching, good materials of instruction, a favorable pupil-teacher ratio, and love. Sadly, it is a head start to nowhere for many youngsters in school systems that do not follow through with enriched programs in subsequent schooling.

Soon public kindergartens will be functioning in most states as part of the expanding educational system. The history of this decade must not record that the previously existing content and structure of education were little affected by this development. Colleges and universities can act as an observatory from which to monitor what happens. They can provide the needed research underpinnings for change, and they must stimulate schools to modify old programs.

TEACHER CERTIFICATION

The interests of children, the public at large, and the teaching profession will best be served by two changes in the certification of teachers: (a) more flexibility in requirements and thus greater flexibility in preparation of beginning teachers, and (b) reciprocal agreements among all fifty states to recognize one another's certifications. To date, twenty-eight states recognize approval by the National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education as a basis for reciprocity.

Teacher education and the teaching profession are still plagued with unwarranted peculiarities of some state certification regulations. Failure to reciprocate is seriously impeding the free flow and recruitment of teachers. The issue of reciprocity has been wrangled over long enough. The time has come for some kind of nationwide agreement. You in teacher education have a stake in this issue and can aid your graduates by pressing for needed action.

CHARACTER EDUCATION

The United States is in the throes of agonizing change in almost every realm. None is more basic to the quality of life than the area of moral and spiritual values. Studies of what happens to student values in the collegiate environment are not reassuring.

We have passed through a season of pseudo-sophistication during which it was unpopular to do more than engage in sterile philosophizing about the character-molding responsibilities of higher education. Meanwhile, the entire fabric of American life has experienced a frightening increase in crime and lawlessness. Criminal acts are said to be increasing at six times the rate of population growth.

The cost of crime is astronomical. Direct costs to school systems in acts of vandalism, extra guards, and lowered efficiency of instruction are large. If the cost of crime in our society could be cut in half, we could create the schools we dream of with the savings. Hopes lies not in building bigger jails but in crime prevention through more cooperative efforts of education, business and industry, the judicial system, police authorities, and other agencies.

If teachers are to be effective partners in this effort, the preparation programs should recognize that the problem of crime exists, that it is now mostly a youth problem, and that schools are a chief bulwark for prevention.

To orient teachers to their vital role in character development, colleges should turn some of their attention to the plight of the nation's penal and correctional institutions. Almost without exception, we in teacher education think and teach as if the threatening demiworld of crime did not exist. Few of us ever go near a jail, a juvenile court, or an institution for delinquents, to discover how limited are their rehabilitative programs and how badly they need our help. We prefer to shut these unpleasant, deeply puzzling matters out of our minds.

When will the full power of the educational enterprise be aimed at the prevention and cure of delinquency? Surely it is not beyond reason to expect teacher education to take a fresh look at its responsibilities.

RESEARCH EVALUATION

Most of the useful research projects in learning and teaching have been campus-based. Leaders of teacher education spearheaded the drive for increased appropriations for educational research from the federal government. The stimulating effect of this investment has been widely felt.

It would seem logical for school systems, working closely with member institutions of AACTE, to undertake more searching evaluation of education-related research. Neither school teachers nor administrators are able to cope with the quantity of research being reported. Assistance should be given to schools in distinguishing the good from the bad and in communicating more rapidly the operational implications of our most valid and significant research.

Careful assessment of the research which professors engage in and renewed effort to act upon the best of it are essential if financial support for educational research is to continue in the dimension needed. Philanthropic foundations and governmental agencies have alternative uses for their resources. We in education cannot afford, nor can communities, a lessening of interest and investment in research to improve the educative process. But there must be clearer evidence than now exists that research findings are influencing teachers, schools, and the preparation of teachers. Otherwise, the compelling needs for research in important areas such as population, communication, urban studies, manpower, rural life, and government itself may preempt available funds.

A NEW LABORATORY SCHOOL

The colleges and universities that educate teachers have long confronted two problems, one internal and the other external. Internally, much progress has been made over the past twenty years in combining more effectively the strengths of the academic disciplines and the departments and schools of education. We have not yet achieved Utopia, but dialogue, interface, interaction—call it what you will—has improved measurably.

Externally, the relations between institutions that prepare teachers and school systems in their vicinity leave much to be desired. Despite notable exceptions, the chronic complaint persists that too many professors—especially in the academic disciplines, but also in professional education—spend little or no time in elementary and secondary schools and are really out of touch with education's mainstream. To the extent that the allegation is correct, teacher education fails to employ the one means it has to make preparation programs real and relevant.

An exhortation to college administrators and professors to spend more time in local schools and in visiting notable ones in other regions would be wasted effort. All professors think they are fully occupied, and many are heavily overcommitted. What could make a difference is an organic tie between a school system and an institution teaching teachers, a linkage that supplements and goes beyond the usual arrangements for supervised student teaching.

In my judgment, we are soon to see a few trial arrangements consummated by local authorities for the management and operation of public schools by profit-making organizations in the so-called "knowledge industry." Where results of traditional management of schools have been poor, perhaps this radical approach deserves a try.

If industrial corporations can enter into contracts with school boards for the conduct of schools, so can universities and colleges. The latter already advise schools on how to conduct their business, so presumably they have the know-how to execute as well as to consult. Recently a contract was signed between Antioch College and the Washington, D. C., school system for the operation by Antioch of the Morgan Elementary School "in consultation with a community school board."[5]

---

[5] Jacoby, Susan. "National Monument to Failure." *Saturday Review* 50:19; November 18, 1967.

To put colleges preparing teachers squarely into the deepest, most vital domestic issue that faces our nation, I propose that each member institution of AACTE seek to enter into a contract for the operation of a new type of laboratory school. This contract would involve management, not of the best school or even a mid-range school, but of one beset by problems. Where a ghetto-like environment needs improvement, a school serving that area would be a desirable one to consider.

Why an underprivileged school? For one thing, school systems need less help in the management of learning for bright, culturally privileged children. The usefulness, and therefore the justification, to a doubting school board or citizenry would come from the chance to turn a difficult situation into a hopeful one. Schools struggling to succeed in racial desegregation of their faculties and students need help throughout this country. Amid all the current unrest over civil rights, some things need to be working out well. Success in the schools will do more than anything else to bring cessation of hostility and a sense of positive accomplishment.

The advantage to the contracting higher institution is in the enlarged opportunity such a contract, properly drawn, can provide for experimentation, for preparation of young teachers who expect to teach in similar situations, for a new kind of relationship of professors to schools, and for the vitalization of teacher preparation.

For the school system, such a contract could do much to change the image of the ghetto school from that of a place where teachers do not want to go because of lack of resources and support with which to meet problems to that of a place where the action is: a school bursting with the excitement of new ideas, new resources, and a new kind of prestige. The value of a contract laboratory school as a change agent in the educational system could be substantial.

In consultation with school system officials, the college would be given freedom to select teachers and administrators and to make curriculum changes. With this freedom, it is to be hoped that new approaches which would normally require years to achieve through systemwide consideration might be introduced more readily.

The not always whispered plaint of people in teacher education is, "If we only had the authority to. . . ." The contract school could be the proving ground for ideas as varied as team teaching with its use of paraprofessional aides and specialists, electronically equipped classrooms with computer-assisted instruction, an advanced guidance system, ungraded classes where pupils work at their individual rates of learning, and a year-around program.

Here would be opportunity to explore how children learn from each other through self-motivation, self-directed learning, and team *learning* as well as team *teaching*. Here would be offered a chance to explore what happens when children are involved as genuine partners in planning their learning experiences. Here could be created in miniature the open, democratic society in which teachers and children of any race, color, or creed can grow and prosper.

Where traditional methods have failed, this new contract school would demonstrate the power of the self-concept in learning and seek to involve parents deeply in the further understanding of their children and themselves. In administration, the new role of the school principal could be more nearly that of coordinator of the faculty for instruction than that of caretaker for the central administration.

With such a school as I have proposed, we would have new hope for meeting the rising expectations of people who live in the ghetto and for helping to change the ghetto into something better. In the process, teacher education would change in a desirable and an indelible way.

AND IN CONCLUSION

It is indeed a high privilege to address you ladies and gentlemen who are the "movers and shakers" in teacher education. Your institutions have the tools and the leverage with which to attack the major problems of the human condition. You have the influence and the responsibility to see that your institutions apply their full resources to the problems and goals of our nation's schools.

If your task has been difficult in the past, the dual factors of rising expectations and new demands will make your effective performance more compelling in the future. Never has teacher education been closer to the "eye of the storm" in our society. Never has it been more urgent to help individuals find personal fulfillment, to help rebuild communities, to help achieve our national purpose, and to help create a rational world.

The challenge to teacher education is awesome, but it can be met by men and women who possess the four C's: concern, courage, competence, and charisma. The fundamental question is not: What can we do? It is: What will be our response?

A CONSUMER'S HOPES AND DREAMS FOR TEACHER EDUCATION

ELIZABETH D. KOONTZ

THE TENTH CHARLES W. HUNT LECTURE

Presented at the Twenty-first Annual Meeting of
the American Association of Colleges for
Teacher Education
Chicago, Illinois
February 26, 1969

Elizabeth Duncan Koontz was born on June 3, 1919, in Salisbury, N. C., into a family of educators. Both of her parents were teachers and, after she was graduated from Livingstone College in Salisbury, she earned a master's degree in elementary education from Atlanta University to prepare for a teaching career. Next came further graduate work at Columbia and Indiana universities, and then studies in special education for slow learners and disadvantaged children at North Carolina College at Durham.

In addition to active years in educational association work at both the local and state levels, Mrs. Koontz came up through the ranks of the National Education Association to become its president in 1968. Previously she had been president of the NEA's Association of Classroom Teachers. Her many other professional memberships have been with organizations devoted to work in special education. She is a member of NEA's Council for Exceptional Children and the National Association for Retarded Children. She was appointed by President Johnson to the National Advisory Council on the Education of Disadvantaged Children in 1965 and is a member of the education committee of the National Urban League.

Her travels have taken her to observe the effects of the Berlin Wall as a guest of the German Teachers Association in West Berlin; she also attended conferences of the World Confederation of Organizations of the Teaching Profession in Seoul, Vancouver, and Dublin. Invited by the *Saturday Review,* Mrs. Koontz was one of sixteen Americans requested to visit the Soviet Union in 1964 to discuss ways of improving relations between our countries.

The high regard felt for her leadership in education was reflected in her appointment by President Nixon to head the Women's Bureau of the U.S. Department of Labor in January 1969.

A CONSUMER'S HOPES AND DREAMS FOR TEACHER EDUCATION

BY ELIZABETH D. KOONTZ

THE TENTH CHARLES W. HUNT LECTURE

Ten years ago, Dr. Laurence Haskew ended the first Charles W. Hunt lecture by saying, "Inspired by the career of Charles W. Hunt, I have tried to say that what we need is not more social analysis but more leaders, and say it in such fashion that every person here is looking forward to having a lecture series named after him also."

Tonight, ten years later, the need for leadership and not just more social analysis is an imperative if we are to progress toward a free and open society for all.

Teaching is the mother profession. Without teaching there would be no other professions. There is in this room, without doubt, the greatest assembly of leadership in teacher education in the world. And since so much depends upon you, and since you are captives for this fleeting moment in history, my choice is to speak to you from the perspective of a consumer of teacher preparation. Obviously, the ultimate consumers are the children and youth of the society and, in a sense, all citizens are consumers of teacher education. But my remarks are to be construed more as those of a classroom teacher of thirty years. Obviously, such an approach tends to establish a consumer-producer dichotomy. This approach is deliberate because that is exactly what we have too much of—dichotomy, that is! Thus, my first hope and dream is that teacher education should truly become a joint endeavor between the practitioners in the field and the college and university personnel.

It might be held by some that this is now the case. And so it is in a few experimental and special programs. But the large majority of beginning teachers advance through a program in which their relationships with the field are, at best, superficial and, often, largely irrelevant to the real world of the beginning teacher. For example, by admission of our own leaders, student teaching is in a shambles. The following quotation is taken from a nationally constituted joint committee report on student teaching:

> Today, student teaching is entangled in a mass of confusion, unmade decision, and expediencies. It lacks a comprehensive definition and a clear-cut statement of goals and purposes. Despite the fact that student teaching must be a cooperative endeavor, in many cases the personnel in colleges and universities, public schools, professional organizations, and state departments of education who are most concerned and involved are not working closely enough together. Some colleges and universities develop programs and merely notify the schools of their plans. Others turn the whole enterprise over to the public schools. In both instances, the

> key people involved in implementing the programs have no part in formulating them. While a few state departments of education are organized to solve problems in student teaching, most states still have no plan or structure.[1]

That such a general condition prevails is not to say that there are no studies, models, and experiments which show the way. Then why has there been no general acceptance of closer ties between teacher preparation institutions and public school personnel? Could it be that our values are somewhat askew? In this materialistic society we reward what we value. In a recent study sponsored by the NDEA National Institute for Advanced Study in Teaching Disadvantaged Youth (sponsored by AACTE), it was discovered that when well-established college professors volunteered in an experiment to teach part-time in high schools, they experienced a decline in their status among their learned colleagues. And, of course, in the case of cooperating teachers, who most often provide the closest links between the schools and teacher education institutions, the responsibility of "having a practice teacher" is usually one added to an already full teaching load. It is rare to find a school district that has established the responsibility for working with student teachers, interns, or beginning teachers as a part of a mature teacher's regular, assigned schedule. What does this say about reward or status? Or for the importance of teacher education? Here we experience the epitome of contradiction.

---

[1] Joint Committee on State Responsibility for Student Teaching. *A New Order in Student Teaching: Fixing Responsibilities for Student Teaching*. Washington, D. C.: National Commission on Teacher Education and Professional Standards, National Education Association, 1967. p. 2.

To advocate that teacher education should be a joint endeavor does not imply that colleges and universities should abdicate the major responsibility for the initial education of teachers. It implies, rather, that since colleges and universities have major responsibility, they should use their status and power to develop the feedback relationship so vital to the process of educating teachers for greater reality. In this regard, at last year's Hunt lecture, Dr. Felix Robb noted that exhorting college personnel to spend more time in local schools would be, in his words, "wasted effort." He added, "What *could* make a difference is an organic tie between a school system and an institution teaching teachers, a linkage that supplements and goes beyond the usual arrangements for supervised teaching."

Dr. Robb then proposed that each member institution of AACTE seek to enter into a contract with a school district for the operation of a school "beset by problems," meaning a ghetto or rural slum school. In suggesting this, Dr. Robb conceived a contract providing for "a new kind of relationship of professors to schools, and for the vitalization of teacher preparation." To my knowledge few, if any, such contracts have been established. The status quo is extremely tenacious. And, therefore, we possibly need a third force.

And again we do not lack for suggestions or models. Over two years ago representatives of six key national groups, after two years of study, issued the call for legally established professional standards boards[2] in each state whose responsibilities would include the encouraging of programs, studies, and research designed to improve teacher education. This study recommends a board made up of a balanced representation of the profession and conceived as an adjunct to the state board of education. Several states are seriously considering such standards boards. Such a vehicle could be instrumental in bringing the college and school personnel together in more effective programs for teacher preparation. And such a board might well uncover or develop new leadership. To be sure, the professional associations are going to be pushing the idea.

Surely any action that would promise integration of the forces for improving teacher education is worthy of consideration. The experience of my own region and what the land-grant colleges did for agriculture keep coming to mind. In short, do we dare hope that the universities and colleges could now somehow do the same for public education? Remember, this would require specific research, testing of the findings, and broadly disseminating those findings by means of field work. In the case of agriculture, all three phases were essential. If what had been discovered through research and testing had not been disseminated, we would not be able to produce the abundance of food and fiber we do now. All the research and experimentation in animal and plant husbandry, commercial fertilizer, weed control, crop rotation, contouring, irrigation, flood control, insect control, and all the rest would have come to naught had the farmers not been *taught* to use what was discovered. This was done through a nationally subsidized system which incorporated all the necessary elements for success: experimental stations and a system of county agents could be found in nearly every state. And this may prove the key to the present condition confronting the schools, especially those which serve poor people, who are most often also members of a minority. The studies and social analyses of the plight of children in such schools are known to all. Indeed, so much has been said about the ghetto schools, Appalachia, rural slums, etc., that we are sometimes led to believe that most of the ills of America reside there.

---

[2] National Education Association, National Commission on Teacher Education and Professional Standards. *Guidelines for Professional Standards Boards.* Washington, D. C.: the Commission, 1967.

But these problems are only the symptoms of a dangerous social illness running to the very core of our nation and threatening our survival. Indeed, the impact of much of the current research, especially as it is related to lower economic classes and minority groups, is in reality moralistic and condescending. Moreover, the data gathered are often used to support well-established, class-bound prejudgments of those "disadvantaged." And, to put it candidly, much of our current social analysis and study directs attention away from the *residual problem in the total society* which, in turn, tends to keep many a human being in an inferior position.

Frankly, what would have happened to the economically impoverished farmer had society assumed that the ills of agriculture rested with him, his family, his style of life, his innate inferiority, and his technological ignorance?

In my opinion, we must now exert a national thrust to do for public education what was done for agriculture. True, the parallel is not absolute, but it should stimulate some thinking. In such a thrust, the preparation of educational personnel would be related to institutions because we now know we must bring about change in both institutions and personnel. The Education Professions Development Act, the Teacher Corps, fellowship programs, all are beginnings, but only beginnings. They are only catalytic in nature, and we all know that projects financed by soft money too often do not affect the hard-core system, no matter what the intentions. What is needed is leadership from the base institutions where most of the teachers are prepared. With their help, couldn't a national design be created to move us toward needed reform in both teacher education and education in general? Certainly we must develop leverages for reform.

A second hope I have for teacher education could have been included as a part of the above discussion but, for purposes of emphasis, I've set it apart. In my opinion, teacher education should become an educational continuum whereby the abrupt lines between selection, initial preparation, induction into the profession, and graduate and continuing education tend to disappear. We are told that to keep abreast today requires a complete cycle of retraining once every ten years. But this should be a continuous process. And such retraining and reeducation must include both subject matter and evolving methodologies. From firsthand experience, I can tell you unequivocally that much of the continuing or in-service education for teachers is an insult to them. Not only is much of it irrelevant, it is also *imposed*; and often professional teachers are made to feel that "they just don't know what is best for them." Again let us recognize that there are exceptions to this, but it is generally true that mature teachers are seldom afforded opportunity to be effectively involved in the planning and execution of their own continuing education. Narrowly conceived concepts of credentialing establish the mode; and too often the systems of rewards and punishment demolish any chance for intrinsic motivation based upon the individual program needs of a given teacher. The school system itself, then, often mitigates against adequate continuing education for teachers. Surely such education must become a part of every teacher's regular teaching assignment. Moreover, teachers are beginning to move vigorously for the right to plan and control their own continuing education programs. Why shouldn't professional teacher groups enter into contract for services of their choice from colleges and universities? It would be in the public interest for the school district or the state, or both, to finance such efforts.

Indeed, there is precedent for local boards of education to contract with teacher preparation institutions, not only for continuing education but also for establishing new career programs so that youngsters of humble origin and limited experience can advance through a series of meaningful work-study experiences step by step and eventually become fully qualified teachers. Such a program has other ramifications, but it is moving all too slowly. Evidently it still has not caught the imagination of our leadership.

Such programs should, of course, be only the beginning of the educational continuum, but they could be designed to dovetail with continuing education.

One persistent problem which sometimes inhibits the steady and continuous education of mature teachers is the certification process. The current movement, supported by NCTEPS (and others, I assume), suggests one initial legal license, followed by a process for the appropriate professional specialty groups to assume responsibility for advanced credentialing. This is an idea that is consistent with professional self-government. But again, this will probably require some new legal machinery, namely, the professional standards boards mentioned earlier. But surely, if a plan that involved the appropriate specialty groups existed, it would stimulate productive relationship between preparation institutions and practitioners in the field. In fact, such a procedure would require a degree of formalized relationship; and each group could then do its own research and study, and make its recommendations to the state professional standards board, which would be the coordinating agency.

This brings me to a third hope and dream, namely, that teacher education, both initial and continuing, be individualized.

> Teachers cannot be effective without having more opportunity to search for authentic existence. Each of us has his values and needs, and these must be developed by discovering for oneself authentic responses to each situation one faces. What we are, can be, and ought to be, is forever changing. And it is precisely here that we are too often failing in teacher education. Each human being is unique; he should not be molded.[9]

If individuals are unique, and they are, then it is hopelessly inefficient to run them all through the same mill at the same time. As to individualized programs, the cry is that "we can't do that because the problem is too massive." Or we say it's not economically feasible. If these clichés stop us, then I invoke more special help from the good Lord for our world, for it is precisely individualized programs for children and youth that must be the basis for educational reform. And this means retraining experienced teachers and initially preparing teachers who can work in a whole series of new relationships with children, other teachers, paraprofessionals, and specialists.

---

[9] The Journal of Teacher Education, "In Situ," (Editorial) *The Journal of Teacher Education* 19: 4, Winter 1968.

The time is here when the teacher will have his own staff as well as new modalities for teaching. The day of the self-contained classroom as we once knew it is probably passing; but this does not mean back to departmentalization, but on to the integration of means and substance. The implications for teacher education are tremendous. There will be individualized programs. We know that students learn at least as much from other students as from their professors. We have only begun to explore the potential of independent study. The new self-teaching devices, the computer, etc., are rendering overdependence on the lecture an anachronism.

Notice I did not say to exclude lectures. However, college students are telling us by every means possible that they want to be educated, not talked at. They want to be involved. And surely, one primary ability all teachers must cultivate and possess is that of dealing with vigorous, and sometimes destructive, dissent. Indeed, teachers must have not only the essential academic preparation; equally important is what we in education call "being sensitive" and you professors call "the affective domain." This is especially true when working with children whose value systems vary from one's own. Teachers should not be judges, but educators and scholars. Children perceive almost instinctively when a teacher treats them "differently" or subconsciously assumes they can't learn. Although we will probably agree that no teacher should ever contribute to a child's image of self-failure, we all know about the self-fulfilling prophecy syndrome. Alienation leads to withdrawal, hostility, and ultimately to violence. This is just another reason for individualized programs for teacher education. Teachers must be better equipped and more sensitive to the difference between being one's brother's keeper and one's brother's brother. Being another's keeper, or being kept, leads to paternalism, condescension, and submission, which, in turn, project an illness of our total society. The power to cure the illness depends first on correctly discerning who is ill.

The fourth hope and dream I have is the last one I'll discuss tonight. It is really stated in the form of a question. How can we develop a systematic orientation and induction of prospective teachers into the actual world of teaching? The problems they have to cope with in the system, where to take hold, how to maintain the precepts of teaching in difficult situations, how to maintain the integrity of self, and the like are issues beyond the pale of course-work per se. Nevertheless, let's face it, these are some of the essentials of successful teaching! The low status of the public school teacher is a problem affecting all teachers, no matter how secure. The new militancy of teachers is very often misunderstood or dismissed

5

as an aberration of behavior. But to do so is to avoid the issue. The study of the sociology of education is respectable. Now the sociology of the teaching profession should become a matter for greater study and concern. What are we dealing with anyway? Why has teaching become the low man on the totem pole, even though it is the mother profession?

We have only begun to study what really constitute the essential teaching tasks or essential abilities a teacher must possess. Possibly we've expected too much of single individuals. Dr. John Macdonald has some choice words on this subject:

> The most serious problem of teacher education is the inability of preparing institutions to validate their programs and the consequent tendency for these programs to become instruments of professional legitimation. There are other problems, however, of almost equal importance, and one in particular seems to me to warrant close inspection. This is the way in which teaching is currently defined in teacher education institutions and elsewhere. . . .
>
> No other profession in its training practices has married assumptions about the fate of the practitioner so curiously as teaching. On one hand, the practitioner is seen as an individual, with unique, unshared, and frighteningly comprehensive responsibilities, in support of which his personal resources will be severely tried. He is seen, that is, as a heroic figure, and, of course, the hero-practitioner is a recurring theme in the lore of all the professions, from the detection of crime to the healing of the sick. He is also seen, however, as one who will enter a world in which the essential choices that determine the nature of work have already been made, so that he, too, becomes a follower of the single common path, or, to use a simple term of similar meaning, a functionary. Such a pair of assumptions are not natural partners, and teacher education institutions will continue to suffer from a

> paralysis of the will to action so long as the strange juxtaposition continues.[4]

In my opinion we all suffer from time to time a "paralysis of the will." Maybe we are expecting the impossible under the existing conditions. Maybe we need to attack the conditions and not dwell quite as much on symptoms. It will require courageous leadership to attack these conditions in ways that will produce effective reform in teacher education, the school system, and the real world of teaching.

Tonight, I've discussed four distinct hopes and dreams for teacher education. They are all interrelated and obviously constitute selected aspects of the problems of teacher education. An attempt has been made to be constructively critical—since most progress only starts with the positive dissent implicit in "I think it can be done better." I believe it can.

Surely over the years we have made great progress. No one doubts that we're doing better than ever before, but unfortunately we must always consider time and place in any assessment. For time and place, we must accept the fact that in many ways we are not progressing rapidly enough. Indeed, for time and place, we are in trouble. Some would argue that we have a crisis of leadership.

Possibly our great hope is the younger people. The youth preparing for and coming into the teaching profession are wiser, more sensitive, and better educated than any generation before them. They see the hypocrisy of speaking one way and performing another. They refuse to be hypocrites, and they are being criticized for exposing the distance between projected expectations and performance. When this gap widens, it becomes a credibility gap. The youth of the world sense such a gap. And their favorite word is "relevant." I'm with them on both counts. How many students serve on substantive committees in teacher education institutions? Most often they are kept at arm's length. We are now witnessing a condition where the statistics are improving and the conditions tend to worsen. Aspirations are thwarted, expectations are not met. And this is the stuff that revolution is made of.

---

[4] Macdonald, John. "Teacher Education: Analysis and Recommendations." *The Teacher and His Staff: Differentiating Teaching Roles.* Washington, D. C.: National Commission on Teacher Education and Professional Standards, National Education Association, 1969. p. 3.

Again, ten years ago, Dr. Haskew said, "Show me a profession whose chief means of communication is the exchange of traditional clichés and I will show you one whose leaders are throwing custard pies in an age of nuclear missiles."

If I've used any clichés, I hope they weren't merely traditional. I end, as I started, with an appeal to the leadership in this room to dare to hope and dream and lead accordingly. Surely effective leadership in these days is a high-risk operation. This is a time when *no* action becomes one of the worst kinds of action. My plea is to bring the consumer and the producer together in more effective programs for teachers. The dichotomy must largely disappear if we are to do justice to ourselves, our children, and the world.

Allow me to thank the AACTE for making this opportunity possible. The potential leadership of those assembled here can hardly be overestimated. I hope in a small way I've stimulated a constructive thought or two. But above all, I hope I've moved at least some of you to more vigorous action.

In closing, allow me to reflect the thought that men like Charles W. Hunt have brought us through to this point. They taught us the fine art of dissatisfaction with the status quo and how to lead. And this is the essence of the great democratic experiment. If we are to remain a free and open society, major responsibility rests with the leaders and institutions represented in this room. There is no substitute for adequate education.

❦